



Small Arms and Gender-Based Violence in Montenegro





For further details contact:

**UNDP Montenegro
Beogradska 24b
81000 Podgorica
Montenegro**

Tel (+382)(81) 231 251
Fax (+382)(81) 231 644
www.undp.org.yu/montenegro

Small Arms and Gender-Based Violence in Montenegro, Podgorica, 2007

ISBN: 978-86-7728-071-0

Acknowledgment

This report was written by Ljiljana Krkeljić, a specialist in Clinical Psychology in Podgorica in June 2007. Special thanks go to the Police Administration, the SOS line network in Montenegro, Montenegrin Women's Lobby and Safe House for Women for their cooperation.

© UNDP Montenegro 2007 – All rights reserved

The opinions presented in this report are the opinions of the author only and do not necessarily coincide with the standpoints of European Union, United Nations Development Programme. The designations used and materials presented in the publication do not reflect the positions of the European Union, United Nations Development Programme concerning 1) the legal status of any country, territory or area, or their bodies or armed forces; or 2) delimitation of their borders or state borders.

Contents

Executive Summary	i
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. A Wider Context for Understanding the Use of Arms in Gender-Based Violence	2
2.1. Previous Research on SALW in Montenegro	2
2.2. Data on Small Arms possession in Montenegro.....	3
3. Mechanisms for Protection of Gender Differences in Montenegro	3
4. Female population in Montenegro.....	4
5. SALW in Gender-Based Violence.....	4
5. 1. Aim of the Study:	4
5. 2. Sources of Data:.....	4
6. Overview of Data Obtained	6
6. 1. General Remarks on Data Obtained	6
6. 2. Police Directorate of Montenegro	6
6.3. Records of the NGO SOS Line for Women and Children Victims of Violence.....	7
6. 4. Overview of Data by Municipality.....	8
6.4.1 SOS Line Podgorica.....	8
6.4.2. SOS Line Nikšić.....	16
6.4.3. SOS Line Berane.....	18
6.4.4. SOS Line Plav.....	19
6.4.5. SOS Line Bar.....	21
6.4. 6. SOS Line Ulcinj.....	22
6.4.7. SOS Line Bijelo Polje.....	24
7. Records of the NGO “Safe House for Women” in Podgorica.....	25
8. Records of the NGO Montenegrin Women’s Lobby.....	29
9. “Women’s Crime Pages 2005“ – analysis of daily papers “Pobjeda“, “Republika” and “Dan” in 2005, done by Lidija Tomažević - NGO “Anima“ – Kotor.....	30
10. SALW Overview – Articles Published in the Daily “Vijesti” 2003, Aleksandar Pajević, Montenegro Media Institute	34
11. SUMMARY.....	36
Recommendations	37
Annex A – Attitudes towards Arms and Gender Differences	38
Annex B – SOS Line Podgorica – Data Analysis 2002 - 2007.....	40
Annex C – SOS Line Nikšić – Data Analysis 2002 - 2006	49



Executive Summary

Data shows that the family context, otherwise a synonym for protection and safety, in some situations becomes a source of violence and violation of fundamental human rights. It is known that domestic violence usually occurs when there is a need to gain and maintain dominance and control over another human being. All the data obtained in the course of this research show that women are the primary victims of family violence, and also suffer other forms of violence outside the home.

The United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women describes violence against women as a “manifestation of historically unequal power relations between men and women”. At the same time, violence is one of the “crucial social mechanisms by which women are forced into a subordinate position compared with men.”

Although domestic violence in Montenegro, just like anywhere else in the world, violates many rights protected by international human rights conventions and also constitutes a violation of domestic laws, one of the biggest obstacles in recognising family violence as a violation of human rights is the belief that “personal” bodily injuries and emotional distress suffered within one’s family are not subject to any law, be it domestic or international. This is also one of the biggest obstacles to victims seeking help and protection.

Considering the fact that in such a social environment we see a willingness on the part of women to seek and receive help, the results obtained are highly relevant for understanding gender-based violence. As for domestic violence in Montenegro, defined as a pattern of abuse and use of force including threats, isolation and intimidation, the use of firearms deepens the issue of violence considerably, posing a direct threat to the life of the victim, and to her physical and mental integrity. Since it is men who mostly own arms, and judging by the statements of battered women that it is their husbands, partners, brothers and sons who threaten them with weapons, women are paying a high price for the presence of firearms in the home.

Violence against women involving the use of firearms is not an inevitable phenomenon, but a result of tolerance of, and leniency towards the issue, which is part of Montenegrin historic and cultural patterns. No matter what the social context of domestic violence and violence against women may be like, the presence of weapons always has the same effect – the more weapons there are, the more danger to women they pose. Montenegrin society has some serious issues to tackle in order to prevent the abuse of small arms and to curb the culture of armed violence, which is, considering the current situation (vis-a vis the presence of arms in Montenegrin homes) a highly complex task. The reasons for this lie in the immediate destructive effect of the use of firearms in violent behaviour, as well as in the socialisation effects of such patterns, which may have a trans-generational character as role models for behaviour.

Awareness of the fact that armed violence poses a risk to life and health, and that the family context in which it happens does not reduce this risk, should be a high priority issue when considering strategies for the reduction of civilian possession of small arms. The pattern of keeping armed violence within the boundaries of family secrets and the traditional role of women as their guardians means that responses to violence necessitate help both for the victim and for the perpetrator. In order to develop such awareness in Montenegrin society there needs to be proper victim protection mechanisms in order to develop a sense of safety and trust in society’s response to domestic violence. Protection mechanisms would function most effectively if they operate within a multi-sectoral approach and involve various forms of protection from the police, the judiciary, and social and health care sectors at the same time as activities aimed at changing public attitudes and prejudices upon which many patterns of behaviour concerning the possession, carrying and use of arms are based.

1. Introduction

The wide availability of small arms in Montenegro poses many questions concerning their impact on the lives of citizens. The issue of arms being held by the citizens of Montenegro and their impact has become a topical issue over the past years through several studies conducted in Montenegro. Thanks to such research, light has been shed on the issue of small arms in Montenegro from several perspectives.

The SALW Survey of Montenegro entitled “A house isn’t a home without a gun” (2004) consists of four components:

- **Small Arms Distribution Survey** - The assessment of data gathered on the type, quantity, possession, distribution and movement of SALW within the country or region;
- **Small Arms Impact Survey** - The assessment of data gathered on the impact of SALW on various community members;
- **Small Arms Perception Survey** - The analysis of qualitative information on the relation of various actors (female and male, young and old) within local communities on SALW possession, its impact and use and possible interventions;
- **Small Arms Capacity Survey** - Overview of data gathered on local capacities for appropriate, safe, efficient and effective SALW interventions.

Two studies conducted in 2006 investigated the impact of small arms on the lives of children in Montenegro. The first study is entitled “Children and Weapons in Montenegro – A Review of Data and Research”, which is based on information that could be provided by the relevant institutions on the impact of SALW on the lives of children, as well as analysis of other available data. The presence of arms poses a huge risk to children as they are exposed either directly or indirectly through their development and socialisation.

The second study, “Knowledge and Attitudes of Children, Youth and Parents towards Small Arms in Montenegro” (a participatory study) shows the views of both children and adults regarding the possession, carrying and use of arms to be very confused and inconsistent. It also became apparent that there is a gap between knowledge, perception, evaluation and feelings related to firearms as a threat on one hand, and action, or readiness to express a positive attitude towards the use of arms on the other. Attitudes towards arms are more positive under certain circumstances: under group pressure, for vengeance or in the case of losing control over oneself or towards oneself. It also became evident that younger children covered by the study (13-14 years of age) had much clearer attitudes towards possession, carrying and use of arms than older ones (15-18 years of age).

Parents show a broader range of attitudes than children of both age groups; they seem to be more than willing to protect their children from the presence of arms in their lives, but themselves are unwilling to give up “protection” of this kind, without being clearly aware of their own role in forming their childrens’ attitudes towards arms, i.e. seemingly unaware of their own behaviour, as role models, being much more powerful than any verbal messages on the danger of arms.

The second study shows some gendered differences in attitudes at all age levels covered by the research to be analysed in more details but which, generally speaking, tend to be quite inconsistent.

This study provides research into the impact of the presence of arms on the lives of women, in particular on gender-based violence involving arms. Non-governmental organisations in Montenegro often draw attention to criminal offences in which women are exposed to violence involving arms: domestic violence, sexual assaults and trafficking. Since violence against women in itself is a multifaceted problem that has been tackled in Montenegro ever more intensively over the past ten years, the gathering of information has proven to be very difficult, mostly because the use of arms in various forms of violence is not recorded separately, and the data was gathered from the statements of women who sought help and the NGOs engaged in protecting women against violence. The data obtained from the Police Directorate reveals yet another aspect of violence against women: criminal offences against the life and integrity of a person committed with the use of firearms. However, regardless of the type of data, they should at least point towards the right course of action, both regarding future, more systematic



recording of the exposure of women to arms and the consequences of such exposure, all the way to the possibility of setting guidelines for the prevention of gender-based violence where small arms are used.

2. A Wider Context for Understanding the Use of Arms in Gender-Based Violence

2.1. Previous Research on SALW in Montenegro

“A house isn’t a home without a gun”: SALW Survey – Republic of Montenegro (2004)

This household study revealed a number of interesting findings on gender differences on attitudes towards arms and various evaluations concerning arms. Here we highlight just those which can provide a context for further understanding gender differences and arms in Montenegro.

Thus, according to this study:

- Both men (32.8 percent) and women (43 percent) believe that possessing arms is dangerous for their family.
- On the other hand, 42.8 percent of men and only 14.8 percent of women believe that arms help to protect the family.
- Within the share of the population percent who believe that there are too many SALW in circulation (84.4 percent), there is an equal number of men and women.
- In addition, 54.3 percent of men and 20.2 percent of women said they would decide to purchase arms legally if they had the opportunity. Here there is a considerable gender gap. This data corresponds with the discussions held in focus groups, as well as interviews held by the research team, which indicate that traditionally men are the buyers and holders of arms in Montenegro, while most of the women consider arms dangerous and believe one should not own them.

“Knowledge and Attitudes of Children, Youth and Parents towards Small Arms in Montenegro “(2006)

Analysing the data obtained in focus group discussions (Annex A) within this participatory research (2006) on attitudes towards owning, carrying and using arms, certain gender differences are apparent. We will present a summary of the analysis of key questions for focus group discussions aiming to track specific attitudes towards arms and male-female trends.

The research covered four groups: the first focus groups – children aged 13 – 14 (Podgorica), second focus group young boys and girls aged 15-18 (Cetinje and Nikšić), the third group parents of elementary school children (Podgorica) and parents of secondary school children (two groups from Nikšić and Cetinje).

If analysing these generalised attitudes of children and parents towards arms from the perspective of gender differences, the following may be summarised:

- Regarding why **young people hold some form of arms** there are no differences in attitudes either according to age or sex. During all focus group discussions there was a noticeable tendency of rejecting the reasons why young people should own some type of arm;
- Concerning the **reasons for keeping arms in one’s home**, there are gender differences in all age groups among focus groups participants. Men of all ages who participated in the discussions within focus groups are more inclined to accept, seek and find reasons as to why one should keep arms at home;
- According to the **children’s** reasons as to why it would be justified for them in their daily life **to carry some type of arm**, there seem to be no major gender differences amongst younger children, while with older children there are more differentiated attitudes of girls and attitudes of boys seem rather confused. It is also evident that there are no gender differences when it comes to the attitude of parents

towards young people and arms, since both mothers and fathers think that there are no reasons for young people to carry arms.

- There are gender differences also concerning the **reasons for carrying arms in the daily lives of adults**. Men are more inclined to believe that arms should be carried for security reasons.
- As for the discussion following the question, ‘What reasons may **motivate the young to use arms?**’ the male-female differences here do not seem to be gender differences, but more determined by the setting and age characteristics, as well as parental roles. It is only older boys who see the use of arms as a particularly male characteristic.
- When discussing the **reasons why adults use arms**, both genders among children approve the use of arms to “protect children”, but in this group, just as is the case with older children, there seem to be no male or female trends. In one group of parents we have only the attitudes of men since women did not express their views. Men believe that the widespread presence of arms as well as the social and political crisis may be some of the reasons for using arms, while mothers from the other group spoke of non-tolerance among people that may be linked to the use of arms.

Thus, certain differences between male and female attitudes may be observed within certain discussions, just as is the case with development trends in forming attitudes towards arms. It seems that the attitudes of adult participants in focus group discussions were more influenced by their parental than by their gender roles.

2.2. Data on Small Arms possession in Montenegro¹

According to the database of the Police Directorate, 73,000 citizens own 98,340 pieces of small arms and light weapons. Women hold 1,341 pieces of arms, as follows:

- 880 pistols;
- 72 revolvers;
- 38 hunting rifles;
- 122 hunting carbine;
- 12 rifles;
- 12 small-calibre rifles.

Thus, out of the total number of legally owned SALW, women hold 1.36 percent, illustrating the fact that men are the most common buyers and owners of arms in Montenegro.

3. Mechanisms for Protection of Gender Differences in Montenegro

The Montenegrin Constitution and Montenegrin laws guarantee equality among citizens and everyone is deemed equal before the law (Article 15). In Montenegro gender equality is advanced through two mechanisms:

- **The Parliamentary Gender Equality Committee** established on 11th July 2001. Its aim is to promote human rights and freedoms concerning gender equality guaranteed by the Constitution. The Committee has the following tasks: consider draft laws to provide for the promotion of gender equality; support international documents concerning gender equality; recommend measures to enhance gender equality in education, health care, public awareness, social policy, employment, entrepreneurship, family and decision-making; participation in gender equality programmes in line with EU standards and cooperation with NGOs dealing with gender equality.
- **The Gender Equality Office**, which was established pursuant to the decision of the Montenegrin Government on 27 March 2003 (Official Gazette of the RoM no.20/03). The Office undertakes expert and other tasks concerning the principles of gender equality and implementation of international conventions and agreements for the needs of the Montenegrin Government, coordinates the activities of government bodies in the field

¹ These data were obtained from Mr Radovan Ljumović (Police Directorate – Podgorica).



and acts as a partner to non-governmental organisations dealing with gender equality and women's human rights issues.

- Recently the discussion on the Draft **Gender Equality Law** was completed in the Parliament. This law, for the first time in Montenegro, promotes equality among men and women and prohibits gender-based discrimination.

4. Female population in Montenegro²

- Out of the total of 620,145 inhabitants in Montenegro, 314,920 are women, or 52 percent of the total population. The total number of women above the age of 18 is 275,183, or some 87 percent of the female population.
- Life expectancy for women in Montenegro is 76.27.
- 9.74 percent of women are illiterate.
- The proportion of women in secondary education is 50.55 percent.
- The proportion of women in employment in Montenegro is 43 percent.
- Women make up 9.8 percent of the Parliament.
- The proportion of women in the Government is 6.25 percent.

5. SALW in Gender-Based Violence

5.1. Aim of the Study:

- To provide a better understanding of the linkages between gender-based violence and SALW, or a better understanding of the circumstances in which SALW is used in gender-based violence and what impact it has on women.
- To provide additional data for policy-making and raising public awareness on SALW and gender-based violence.

5.2. Sources of Data:

- Database of the Police Directorate of Montenegro.
- Records of the NGO "SOS Line for Women and Children Victims of Domestic Violence", offices in Podgorica, Nikšić, Berane, Bar, Bijelo Polje, Pljevlja, Plav, Rožaje and Ulcinj.
- Records of the NGO "Safe House for Women" in Podgorica.
- Records of the NGO "Montenegrin Women's Lobby".
- "Women's Crime Pages 2005" – analysis of electronic dailies "Pobjeda", "Republika" and "Dan" in 2005, conducted by Lidija Tomažević from the NGO "Anima" from Kotor.
- Overview of Light Weapons – articles published in the daily newspaper "Vijesti", 2003, conducted by Aleksandar Pajević, Montenegrin Media Institute.

The Gender Equality Office notified the researcher that they hold no database on gender-based violence or data on the use of SALW in such violence.

Data requested from the Police Directorate

The Police Directorate was sent a request for the following data:

² Statistical Yearbook of Montenegro, 2006 – MONSTAT.

- Number of female SALW victims in criminal offences against life and physical integrity over the past five years and for each year separately;
- Number of women who were threatened with SALW in domestic and other conflicts over the past five years and each year separately.

Data requested from the NGO “SOS Line”

The following data were requested from the non-governmental organisation “SOS Line for Women and Children Victims of Violence”:

- Number of women calling the SOS Line for help over the past five years and for each year separately;
- Number of women threatened by SALW;
- Circumstances under which violence occurred and persons that women identified as perpetrators;
- Type of SALW used.

The request was sent to the following offices:

- Podgorica;
- Nikšić;
- Bijelo Polje;
- Plav;
- Berane;
- Rožaje;
- Pljevlja;³
- Bar; and
- Ulcinj

Data requested from the NGO “Safe House for Women” in Podgorica

The following data was requested from the “Safe House for Women”:

- Number of women placed within the shelter for victims of violence over the past five years and for each year separately;
- Number of women exposed to threat of arms over the past five years and for each year separately;
- Circumstances under which violence occurred and the people women identified as perpetrators;
- Type of SALW used.

Data requested from the NGO “Montenegrin Women’s Lobby – Podgorica”

This non-governmental organisation was requested to provide the following data:

- Number of trafficked women taken into Shelter for Trafficked Women over the past five years and for each year separately;
- Number of women exposed to arms;
- Circumstances under which violence occurred and the persons women identified as perpetrators;
- Type of SALW used.

³ Calls to the SOS Line Pljevlja remained unanswered. I found out unofficially that this office is not currently operating.



Analysis of newspaper articles

- Articles published in the daily “Vijesti” in 2003 on the use of arms in violent and non-violent criminal offences for the purpose of this research were covered from the point of view of why the arms were used where women were victims (Aleksandar Pajević, Media Institute).
- In the same manner, articles from the so-called “crime pages” of the electronic dailies “Pobjede“, “Vijesti” and “Dan” in 2005 were analysed.

6. Overview of Data Obtained

6.1. General Remarks on data obtained

The data obtained do not fully correspond to the data requested due to the fact that databases including information on the type of arms used in various types of conflicts and various forms of violence do not exist. For this reason the processing of data was adapted to specific sources of information making the possibility of drawing general conclusions on the basis of data gathered extremely difficult.

6.2. Police Directorate of Montenegro⁴

From the Police Directorate we received:

- Data on the number of women owning arms already given under the heading “Data on Arms Possession in Montenegro”;
- Data on the number of female victims of criminal offences against life and physical integrity in 2006 and the number of offences committed with arms.

The Police Directorate does not hold records on the number of women that have been threatened with arms.

Number of female victims of criminal offences against life and physical integrity in 2006

According to the data obtained from the Police Directorate in 2006, 49 women in Montenegro were victims of crimes against life and physical integrity. The following table shows the number of victims per type of criminal offence as indicated by the Directorate:

CRIMINAL OFFENCES AGAINST LIFE AND PHYSICAL INTEGRITY OF WOMEN IN MONTENEGRO IN 2006 (POLICE DIRECTORATE)		
	f	percent
Murder	2	4
Aggravated murder	4	8
Attempted murder	6	12
Attempted aggravated murder	3	6
Severe injuries	7	14
Minor injuries	20	42
Threatening with dangerous weapons	6	12
Other	1	2
TOTAL	49	100

Table 1: Frequency of criminal offences against life and physical integrity of women in Montenegro in 2006 (Police Directorate, Podgorica)

⁴ The data were obtained from Mr Zoran Talović (Strategic Planning and Development Unit of the Police Directorate).

As for the use of arms in the above criminal offences, we received only data on firearms without further specification of the type (Table 2).

CRIMINAL OFFENCES AGAINST LIFE AND PHYSICAL INTEGRITY OF WOMEN IN MONTENEGRO IN 2006 (POLICE DIRECTORATE) – USE OF FIREARMS		
	f	percent
Murder	3	42
Aggravated murder	2	29
Attempted murder	2	29
TOTAL	7	100

Table 2: Number of criminal offences in 2006 committed using firearms (Police Directorate, Podgorica)

Of the total number of female victims of violence in the given year, 14 percent were victims of firearms.

The next table shows the number of criminal offences by municipality. It shows that in Berane the greatest number of women (13 percent) were victims of crimes against life and physical integrity, Podgorica being second (11 percent), then Nikšić (10 percent). However, calculating the statistical significance of the differences among these criminal offences by municipality, the difference is of no statistical importance (the chi square test was 8.516 and not statistically significant).

MUNICIPALITIES	CRIMINAL OFFENCES AGAINST LIFE AND PHYSICAL INTEGRITY OF WOMEN IN MONTENEGRO IN 2006 (POLICE DIRECTORATE)	
	f	percent
Berane	13	27
Podgorica	11	23
Nikšić	10	20
Bar	7	14
Herceg Novi	4	8
Bijelo Polje	4	8
TOTAL	49	100

Table 3: Criminal offences against life and physical integrity of women in Montenegro in 2006 by municipality (Police Directorate, Podgorica)

The report does not have any data on the circumstances under which the criminal offences were committed nor anything about the perpetrators.

6.3. Records of the NGO “SOS Line for Women and Children Victims of Violence”

The data relevant for this study were provided by the coordinators and volunteers of these NGOs, since according to the rules of operation of SOS lines, these data may not be disclosed in their original form to anyone outside the organisation.

The records kept by these organisations contain, among other things, data on the type of violence their clients were exposed to, but there is no separate column concerning the use of arms in such incidents.

The data to be presented below have been obtained from the materials (stories of women who reported them) recorded during interviews. All the data on arms came up spontaneously, since the SOS volunteers did not ask direct, planned questions concerning their experiences with arms.



6. 4. Overview of Data by Municipality

SOS Line Podgorica⁵

The data provided by this non-governmental organisation covered the period 2002 to 2005. I quote a remark submitted together with the data provided by this NGO:

“It is important to note that the data obtained through the analysis of minutes of calls kept by the SOS Line Podgorica, recording stories of women who were exposed to arms, were not obtained for such a purpose and are incomplete. One of the reasons for the incompleteness of data on SALW and the type of arms used against women victims of domestic violence is the fact that an armed threat is often implied in those cases when there is a threat of murder or attempted murder, but it is not necessarily a rule since one may be threatened without arms. Furthermore, the threatening use of arms is recorded as a form of physical, but also psychological and emotional violence, and thus often it is generalised. Also, volunteers on duty are often unable to enter all data due to the dramatic moment or non-readiness of women victims of domestic violence to express them.”

The data obtained was on the following:

- Total number of women who sought help through the SOS line for the given period and for each year (2002 – 2007);
- Total number of women who were exposed to the threat of murder in the past five years and for each year separately;
- Total number of women who called the SOS line and who were exposed to threats of arms between 2002 and 2007 and for each year separately.

Total number of women who sought help through the SOS line Podgorica – 2002-2007

Between 2002 and 2007, a total of 1,223 women sought help from the SOS Line Podgorica for exposure to various forms of violence, mostly domestic violence (Table 4). As the table shows, the number of women who seek help each year is approximately the same (224 women on average). There are statistically no significant differences between the number of women who report violence for each of the given years (chi square 2.783)

SOS LINE PODGORICA					TOTAL
NO OF WOMEN WHO SOUGHT HELP (2002-2007)					
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
240	232	239	245	267	1223
20 percent	19 percent	20 percent	20 percent	21 percent	100 percent

Table 4: Total number of cases of the SOS line Podgorica, from 2002 to 2007

In order to have some understanding of what these figures mean in the context of the female population, it should be noted that according to the last census there are 68,983 women above the age of 15 living in Podgorica.

The following table indicates the frequency of murder threats without information on the use of arms and the frequency of the threat of arms for the period 2002 – 2007.

⁵ Data prepared by the intern, Vesna Pavićević, a sociologist, supervised by Biljana Zeković, director of the SOS Line Office in Podgorica.

TYPE OF ARMS	SOS LINE PODGORICA											
	NO OF CASES											
	2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		TOTAL	
	f	percent	f	percent	percent	percent	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent
Pistol	7		2		6		16		8		39	37
Rifle			2				1				3	3
Bomb	2						3		3		8	8
Knife	3		5		1		3		2		14	13
Armed ⁶	9		12		8		9		3		41	39
TOTAL	21	20	21	20	15	14	32	31	16	15	105	100
Threat of murder (without info on the use of arms)	26		16		20		14		9		85	
TOTAL	47		37		35		46		25		190	

Table 5: Total number of women who addressed the SOS line Podgorica who were threatened with arms – by type – for each year separately (2002–2007)

For the given five-year period, 190 women who were exposed to the threat of murder contacted the SOS line in Podgorica (Table 5), or some 16 percent of the total number of women who sought help, and 105 of them (or some 9 percent) were exposed to threats with firearms.

Pistols are used most frequently in threats (37 percent), although there is a significant share of firearms not identified by type (41 percent). The difference in frequencies of the known types of arms used to threaten women is statistically significant and in the range of 001 (chi square = 78.183). Seemingly, pistols are the most widely used firearms in violence against women, most often in domestic conflicts.

The following table indicates the perpetrators, as identified by the victims in their stories of violence. The following table contains the whole range of relations a woman may have with men in private and personal and family communications.

SOS LINE PODGORICA							
WHO ARE THE PERPETRATORS? SOS PODGORICA (2002 - 2006)							
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006.	TOTAL	
	f	f	f	f	f	f	percent
Husband	29	23	19	31	23	125	65.8
Ex husband	8	4	5	2		19	10.0
Partner	1	1	1	1		4	2.1
Woman		1		4	1	6	3.2
Son	4		3	5		12	6.2
Father	2	4	4			10	5.3
Brother	1	1				2	1.1
Father-in-law	1	1	1			3	1.6
Boyfriend		1				1	0.5
Nephew		1				1	0.5
Brother-in-law			2	1		3	1.6
Son-in-law					1	1	0.5
Cousin				1		1	0.5
Neighbour	1			1		2	1.1
TOTAL	47	37	35	46	25	190	100.1

Table 6: Persons identified as perpetrators by women who contacted SOS line Podgorica (2002 – 2007)

⁶ The explanation provided by the SOS Podgorica says it means firearms, but without specification of the type.



It is evident from the data provided by the SOS line Podgorica for the above five-year period that out of 190 cases, perpetrators were known and in almost 97 percent of these were men, whereas 3 percent of them were women.

Considering these SOS line data, it is apparent that women suffered most violence from their husbands (65.8 percent), then ex-husbands (10 percent), sons (6.2 percent) and fathers (5.3 percent), etc.

As for the threats involving the use of arms, the data are provided below in Table 7.

SOS LINE PODGORICA							
WHO THREATENED TO USE ARMS? - SOS PODGORICA (2002 - 2006)							
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	TOTAL	
	f	f	f	f	f	f	percent
Husband	10	15	13	22	14	74	70.5
Ex husband	4	4	1	3		12	11.5
Partner	3			1		4	3.9
Woman		2		1	1	4	3.9
Son	1		1	3		5	4.8
Father	1					1	0.9
Father-in-law	1					1	0.9
Brother-in-law				1		1	0.9
Son-in-law					1	1	0.9
Cousin				1		1	0.9
Neighbour	1					1	0.9
TOTAL	21	21	15	32	16	105	100.0

Table 7: Persons who threatened to use arms (2002-2007- SOS line Podgorica)

Based on the data shown in Table 7, among 105 persons for whom it is known that the perpetrators threatened to use arms, in 70.5 percent cases the perpetrators were husbands, followed by ex-husbands (11.5 percent) and the remaining cases mostly involve members of core and extended families (3.81 percent). Five women (4.8 percent) threatened to use arms in conflicts or committed the criminal offence of attempted murder.

Calculating the statistical significance among the groups (husband, ex husband, son, partner and women) of persons who used arms in violent behaviour we come up with the chi square of 213.4558 significant at the level of 001, meaning that the difference in these frequencies is not coincidental.

Calculating the statistical significance of differences among frequencies of identified groups of persons who threatened to use arms for each year separately for the period from 2002 to 2007, the chi square 7.74375 is not statistically significant.

As for the causes or motifs for violent behaviour, it remains unknown in somewhat over 50 percent of the cases. Among the known causes, the most common ones are: alcoholism on the part of the husband (24 percent), then alcoholism or drug abuse, together with psychological problems (a little over 7percent), mental health issues (around 5 percent), drug abuse (2 percent), and jealousy (1.5 percent), again on the part of the husbands. All of the above are the views expressed by the women themselves.

Analysis of the 2002 data

In 2002 there were 47 cases when women were exposed to murder threats, in 62 percent of the cases by their husbands, then ex-husbands (17 percent) - Table 8. More detailed information on the instances of the use of arms, the type, perpetrators and possible causes (or rather, the causes that have been recorded) may be found in Annex B.

2002 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – MURDER THREATS	F	PERCENT
Husband	29	62
Ex-husband	8	17
Partner	1	2
Son	4	9
Father	2	4
Brother	1	2
Father-in-law	1	2
Neighbour	1	2
TOTAL	47	100

Table 8: Persons behaving violently towards women who reported violence (2002- SOS line Podgorica)

The following table shows the perpetrators who threatened to use arms:

2002 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – THREATENING TO USE ARMS	F	PERCENT
Husband	10	47
Ex-husband	4	19
Partner	3	14
Son	1	5
Father	1	5
Father-in-law	1	5
Neighbour	1	5
TOTAL	21	100

Table 9: Persons who threatened to use arms (2002 – SOS line Podgorica)

Women were exposed to threats with arms by their husbands (47 percent), ex-husbands (19 percent) and partners (14 percent). Thus, out of 240 women who contacted the SOS line in 2002, some 9 percent of them were threatened by the use of arms.

What type of firearm was used to threaten victims? These data are shown below in Table 10.

SOS LINE PODGORICA		
TYPE OF ARMS (2002)	F	PERCENT
Pistol	7	34
Bomb	2	10
Knife	3	14
Firearm	9	42
TOTAL	21	100

Table 10: Type of arms used in reported domestic violence incidents in 2002 (SOS line Podgorica)

Firearms were most frequently used in domestic conflicts in this year (2002), when they were used in 42 percent of reported cases percent. Pistols were used most frequently (34 percent cases), then knives (14 percent) and bombs (10 percent).



Analysis of 2003 data

Who are the persons who behaved violently?

2003 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – MURDER THREATS	F	PERCENT
Husband	23	62
Ex-husband	4	10
Woman	1	3
Partner	1	3
Nephew	1	3
Father	4	10
Brother	1	3
Father-in-law	1	3
Boyfriend	1	3
TOTAL	37	100

Table 11: Persons who behaved violently towards women (2003 – SOS line Podgorica)

As was the case with the previous year, again in 2003, mostly husbands (62 percent) were violent towards their wives, then ex-husbands and fathers (both 10 percent).

Which persons and how many of them used arms in violence against others?

2003 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – USE OF ARMS	F	PERCENT
Husband	15	75
Ex-husband	4	20
Woman	1	5
TOTAL	20	100

Table 12: Persons who threatened to use arms (2003 – SOS line Podgorica)

In 2003, husbands (75 percent) and ex-husbands (20 percent) threatened to use arms. During the same year, one woman threatened to use arms, but according to the SOS data it was in self-defence (Table 12). This means that out of the total of 232 women who sought help, almost 9 percent reported being threatened by arms.

What types of arms were used to threaten women?

SOS LINE PODGORICA		
TYPE OF ARMS (2003)	F	PERCENT
Pistol	2	10
Rifle	2	10
Knife	5	23
Firearm	12	57
TOTAL	21	100

Table 13: Types of arms used in conflicts in 2003 (SOS line Podgorica)

In 2003, firearms were most often used. There are reports of 10 percent of instances involving pistols, 10 percent of rifles and 5 percent of knives (Table 13).

Analysis of 2004 data

This note for the 2004 data was provided by the SOS volunteers:

“The data for 2004 are more superficial and less concrete. In most of the cases involving the threat of murder, as well as in attempted murders, there are very few data on the use of arms. In cases where it is said that the perpetrator was armed, the type of arm is often not mentioned and whether it was used at all”.

Who are the perpetrators?

2004 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR - MURDER THREATS	F	PERCENT
Husband	19	50
Ex-husband	5	13
Father	5	13
Son	4	11
Partner	1	3
Father-in-law	2	5
Brother-in-law	2	5
TOTAL	38	10

Table 14: Persons reported to be violent against women (2004 – SOS line Podgorica)

With regard to the male members of core and extended families, in 2004 husbands accounted for half of the reported incidents of violence, followed by ex-husbands (13 percent), then father (13 percent). Other women suffered violence from other male members of their extended families (Table 14).

What persons and how many of them used arms in violence against women?

2004 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – USE OF ARMS	F	PERCENT
Husband	13	86
Ex husband	1	7
Son	1	7
TOTAL	15	100

Table 15: Persons who threatened to use arms (2004 – SOS line Podgorica)

According to Table 15, it was mostly husbands who threatened to use arms (86 percent). Compared to the total number of reported cases of violence in this year (239), in 7 percent of cases perpetrators threatened to use arms.

What arms were used to threaten victims?

SOS LINE PODGORICA		
TYPE OF ARMS (2004)	F	PERCENT
Pistol	6	40
Knife	1	7
Firearm	8	53
TOTAL	15	100

Table 16: Type of arms used in reported domestic violence incidents in 2004 (SOS line Podgorica)



50 percent of persons acting violently against women in 2004 were husbands of the victims; the highest number of reported cases was due to alcohol consumption, and in 13 percent of cases it involved an ex husband or father, son (11 percent), partner (3 percent) and father-in-law and brother-in-law in 5 percent of cases each (Table 16).

Analysis of the 2005 data

Who are the perpetrators?

2005 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – MURDER THREAT	F	PERCENT
Husband	31	65
Ex husband	2	4
Woman	4	8
Partner	1	2
Son	6	13
Father	1	2
Cousin	1	2
Brother-in-law	1	2
Neighbour	1	2
TOTAL	48	100

Table 17: Persons reported to be violent towards women (2005 – SOS line Podgorica)

As was the case with previous years, violence was most frequently perpetrated by husbands (65 percent), then partners (13 percent), and this year there is a noticeable increase in the number of cases of violent behaviour on the part of women (8 percent). (Table 17). Following the general increase of violence, as well as violence involving the use of arms in 2005, there are increasingly more women behaving violently.

What persons and how many of them threatened to use arms in violence against others?

2005. – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – USE OF ARMS	F	PERCENT
Husband	22	70
Ex husband	3	9
Woman	1	3
Partner	1	3
Son	3	9
Cousin	1	3
Brother-in-law	1	3
TOTAL	32	100

Table 18: Persons who threatened to use arms (2005 – SOS line Podgorica)

In 2005, which, according to the data received from the NGO “SOS Line” had the highest numbers of incidents of violent behaviour towards women, husbands most often used arms to threaten wives (70 percent), but this year there were more “diversified” relations in which women were exposed to the threat of arms and almost all the cases involved men (Table 18). Compared to the total number of reported cases to the SOS line (245), 13 percent reported threats with arms.

What arms were used to threaten victims?

SOS LINE PODGORICA		
TYPE OF ARMS (2005)	F	PERCENT
Pistol	16	50
Bomb	3	9
Knife	3	9
Rifle	1	3
Firearms	9	29
TOTAL	32	100

Table 19: Type of arms used in reported domestic violence incidents in 2005 (SOS line Podgorica)

Out of the total number of cases where arms were used to threaten victims who sought help from the SOS line (32), pistols were most frequently used (50 percent), then other firearms (29 percent), bombs (9 percent) as well as knives (9 percent) (Table 19).

Analysis of the 2006 data

Who are the perpetrators?

2006 – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – MURDER THREAT	F	PERCENT
Husband	23	92
Woman	1	4
Son-in-law	1	4
TOTAL	25	100

Table 20: Persons behaving violently (2006 - SOS line Podgorica)

Women were mostly exposed to violence from their husbands (92 percent). This year one woman tried to kill her husband using a knife.

What persons and how many of them used arms in violence against others?

2006. – SOS LINE PODGORICA		
PERPETRATOR – USE OF ARMS	F	PERCENT
Husband	14	86
Woman	1	12
Son-in-law	1	12
TOTAL	16	100

Table 21: Persons threatening with arms (2006 – SOS line Podgorica)

The data from the above table are in full accordance with the previous one, meaning that the total of 14, or 86 percent of husbands threatened their wives with arms in domestic conflicts (Table 11). Out of the total number of victims in 2006 (267), 6 percent of cases involved threats with arms.



What arms were used to threaten victims?

SOS LINE PODGORICA		
TYPE OF ARMS (2006)	F	PERCENT
Pistol	8	47
Bomb	3	18
Knife	3	18
Firearm	3	18
TOTAL	17	101

Table 22: Types of arms used in reported domestic violence incidents in 2006 (SOS line Podgorica)

In 2006, out of a total of 17 instances of the use of arms in domestic violence, almost half of them (47 percent) involved pistols, while bombs, knives and non-identified firearms accounted for the same number of cases (18 percent each).

Conclusion:

- Summarising reported cases to the SOS line Podgorica for the whole five-year period, 15 percent of women were threatened by arms;
- Most of the threats involved pistols (37 percent), although there is also a significant share of non-identified firearms (41 percent);
- Pistols appear to be the most widely used weapon in domestic violence;
- During the given five-year period, in 190 cases in Podgorica the perpetrators were men in 97 percent of the cases, and women in 3 percent of the cases.
- Women most often suffered violence from their husbands (65.8 percent), then ex-husbands (10 percent), sons (6.2 percent) and fathers (5.3 percent).

6.4.2. SOS Line Nikšić⁷

This non-governmental organisation provided information on:

- The total number of women who sought help from the SOS line for the given period and per each year separately;
- The total number of women who were exposed to the threat of murder for the five-year period and for each year separately;
- The total number of women who sought help from the SOS line and who were exposed to threats with arms from 2002 to 2007 and for each year separately.

The total number of women who sought help from the SOS Line Nikšić for the given period and for each year separately.

This is a general overview of data of the SOS line Nikšić, with a female population over 15 years of age of 30,812 women.

SOS LINE NIKŠIĆ					
NUMBER OF WOMEN WHO SOUGHT HELP (2002-2007)					
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	TOTAL
105	71	76	81	103	436
24 percent	16 percent	17 percent	19 percent	24 percent	100 percent

Table 23: The total number of cases reported to the SOS line Nikšić from 2002 to 2007

⁷ The data were provided by the coordinator of the SOS line Nikšić, Mrs. Nada Koprivica.

From 2002 - 2007, 436 women contacted the SOS line Nikšić, or on average 87 women a year. The difference in frequencies of women who reported to this SOS line is statistically significant at the level of 005 (chi square 11.262); therefore we should consider the factors that caused this. Here there are too few data to be able to give any serious explanation, considering that a range of things could have caused it, ranging from the level of the service provided to some local developments. The greatest number of women sought help from the SOS line Nikšić in the years 2002 and 2006.

TYPE OF ARMS	SOS LINE NIKŠIĆ											
	NO OF PERSONS EXPOSED TO THREATS WITH ARMS (2002-2007)											
	2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		TOTAL	
	f	percent	F	percent	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent
Pistol	3								1		4	23
Axe							1				1	6
Bomb			1								1	6
Knife	2		1		2				3		8	47
Armed ⁸									1		1	6
Cold weapons									2		2	12
TOTAL	5	29	2	12	2	12	1	5	7	41	17	100
MURDER THREAT (no info on the use of arms)	5				2		2		2		11	
TOTAL	10	36	2	7	4	14	3	11	9	32	28	100

Table 24: Total number of callers to the SOS line Nikšić who were threatened with arms – by type, for each year separately (2002–2007)

To sum up, out of a total of 436 women who contacted the SOS line Nikšić for the past five years due to domestic violence, there were 28 registered cases (6 percent) where their lives were threatened, and in 17 cases (4 percent) it is known that they survived being threatened with weapons (Table 24). Below there are percentages of threats with arms in the total number of calls for each year separately.

- 2002 – around 5 percent;
- 2003 - around 3 percent;
- 2004 – around 1 percent;
- 2005 - around 7 percent.

Who behaved violently?

WHO ARE THE PERPETRATORS?- SOS LINE NIKŠIĆ (2002 - 2006)							
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	TOTAL	
	f	f	f	f	f	f	percent
Husband	6	2	3	3	6	20	72
Father	1		1		1	3	10
Grandfather	1					1	4
Brother-in-law	1				1	2	7
Cousin	1				1	2	7
TOTAL	10	2	4	3	9	28	100

Table 25: Perpetrators as reported by the women who contacted the SOS line Nikšić (2002 – 2007)

⁸ The explanation provided by the SOS line Nikšić is that this means firearms, but not specifically which type.



In Nikšić, as in Podgorica, husbands were most often (75 percent) identified as the individuals showing violent behaviour towards women who sought help from the SOS line (Table 25). Unlike Podgorica, here there are far fewer persons from the extended family.

Which persons and how many of them used arms in violence against women?

WHO THREATENED WITH ARMS ?- SOS LINE NIKŠIĆ (2002 - 2006)							
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	TOTAL	
	f	f	f	f	f	f	percent
Husband	4	2		2	4	12	70
Grandfather	1					1	6
Father			1		1	2	12
Cousin					1	1	6
Brother-in-law					1	1	6
TOTAL	5	2	1	2	7	17	100

Table 26: Persons who threatened with arms (2006 – SOS line Nikšić)

According to these data, husbands most often (70 percent) used arms in familial, or inter-partner conflicts, then fathers (12 percent), and then other relatives and in-laws.

The data obtained from the SOS line Nikšić (Annex G) are such that they do not enable any serious discussion of motives or causes of domestic violence.

Conclusion:

- SOS line Nikšić was contacted by 436 women (2002 – 2007) or on average 87 a year;
- Over the same period there were around 4 percent of women who were exposed to threats of the use of arms;
- These women were most often threatened with a knife (70 percent);
- Persons who behaved violently were exclusively men; and were husbands in 70 percent of the cases in the given period.

6.4.3. SOS Line Berane⁹

In Berane there are in total of 13,802 women above the age of 15. The SOS line in Berane was established in 2001, but does not operate continuously. This NGO provided data for two years only: 2005 and 2006.

Data Analysis

How many women decided to seek help and how many among them were threatened with arms in the given two-year period?

SOS LINE BERANE 2005 – 2006						
	2005		2006		TOTAL	
	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	F	
No of women seeking help	56	56	44	44	100	100
No of threats with arms	11	58	8	42	19	100
percent	20		19		19	

Table 27: Total no of women recorded as being victims of domestic violence – SOS line Berane, 2005-2006

⁹ The data were provided by Mrs Olja Stojanović, the coordinator of the NGO SOS Berane.

In 2005 and 2006 a total of 100 women sought help from the SOS line Berane. Threatening with arms was reported by 19 percent of them (Table 27).

In 2005 a total of 56 women addressed the SOS line, 11 of them, or 20 percent were threatened by arms (Table 27).

In 2006 there were 44 battered women, 19 percent of whom reported being threatened by arms.

The difference between the number of women who were exposed to the threat of arms in 2005 and 2006 is not statistically significant (chi square is 0.485).

In domestic violence instances, women were threatened by cold weapons and metal bars.

Who behaved violently?

SOS LINE BERANE 2005 - 2006.		
	2005	2006
	PERCENT	PERCENT
Husband	80	88
Children	15	10
Other family members	5	2

Table 28: Persons who threatened women in 2005 and 2006 – SOS line Berane

According to the data of the SOS line Berane, women most often reported violent husbands (80 percent), then children (15 percent) and other family members.

Unfortunately, for 2006 there are no data on the type of weapon used. The data from the SOS line Berane must be taken with caution since there are very few data on the use of arms, but also because of “not including the number of calls to the SOS line, but only the cases for which there are data available”.¹⁰

Summary:

- In 2005 and 2006 the SOS line Berane was contacted by 100 women;
- Some 19 percent of them reported threats with arms;
- There are data that women were threatened by cold arms and metal bars in domestic violence;
- Most frequent violent behaviour comes from victims' husbands (80 percent).

6.4.4. SOS Line Play¹¹

This non-governmental organisation operating in a town with 5,279 women above the age of 15 provided data for two years, 2005 and 2006, concerning the number of women that reported and the types of violence they were exposed to. For the given period a total of 168 women contacted the SOS line (table 29). Most of them were victims of physical violence (45 percent). There are no data on threats with arms.

¹⁰ The comment given by Olja Stojanović, the coordinator of the SOS Line Berane.

¹¹ These data were provided by Mrs Esmeralda Čuvakić, coordinator of the SOS line in Play.



SOS LINE PLAV 2005						
TYPE OF VIOLENCE	2005		2006		TOTAL	
	F	PERCENT			F	PERCENT
Physical violence	25	33	50	67	75	100
Emotional violence	10	33	20	67	30	100
Sexual violence	5	39	8	61	13	100
Economic violence	5	38	7	62	12	100
Physical and emotional violence	25	33	50	77	75	100
Physical, emotional and economic violence	1	50	1	50	2	100
Incest	1	33	2	67	3	100
Mobbing	2	40	3	60	5	100
TOTAL	74		141		168	100

Table 29: No of reported cases to the SOS line Plav and types of violence, 2005-2006

In 2006 there was an increase in violence against women (chi square 23.124 is significant at the level of 001).

The data obtained from the SOS line Plav show that in 2006:

- One woman was killed with a firearm. The murder was committed by a neighbour;
- Another woman was killed by her husband, but not using arms.

SOS Line Rožaje¹²

In Rožaje there are 8,255 women above 15 years of age.

The SOS Line Rožaje provided the following data:

- Number of women who were provided with SOS line assistance;
- Number of women who were exposed to the threat of arms.

The data is shown in the table below:

YEAR	SOS LINE ROŽAJE		
	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN WHO REPORTED VIOLENCE	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN WHO WERE THREATENED WITH ARMS	
	f	f	percent
2003	52	10	20
2003	83	13	16
2004	98	16	16
2005	103	21	20
2006	118	26	21
TOTAL	454	86	20

Table 30: Relationship between the total number of women and the number of women who were threatened by arms per year (SOS line Rožaje, 2002- 2006)

The number of women contacting the SOS Line Rožaje is increasing, but there are no data to allow for more precise assumptions such as the increase of violence in the community or greater openness towards reporting

¹² The data were provided by Raza Nurković, coordinator of the SOS line Rožaje.

violence (chi square is 37.927 and is statistically significant here). For the use of arms in conflicts chi square is 86.931 and is significant at the level of 001.

Out of the total number of women who called the SOS line (454 for the five-year period), 20 percent reported being threatened with arms.

YEAR	SOS LINE ROŽAJE			
	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN WHO REPORTED VIOLENCE		WOMEN WHO WERE THREATENED WITH ARMS	
	f	percent	f	percent
2002	52	11	10	12
2003	83	18	13	15
2004	98	22	16	19
2005	103	23	21	24
2006	118	26	26	30
TOTAL	454	100	86	100

Table 31: Number of women who reported violence and number of women who were threatened with arms per year (SOS line Rožaje, 2002- 2006)

There is an evident increase in the number of women who call the SOS line, and the difference among frequencies of calls per years is significant at the level 001 (chi square is 37.927).

6.4.5. SOS Line Bar¹³

This SOS line operates in the town with 16,703 women above 15 years of age.

The Bar office of the SOS line provided overall data concerning the number of women victims of violence and the number of women reporting threats with arms (Table 32).

YEAR	SOS LINE BAR		
	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN WHO REPORTED VIOLENCE	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN WHO WERE THREATENED WITH ARMS	
	f	f	percent
2003	106	8	8
2003	85	14	16
2004	45	7	15
2005	47	3	6
2006	43	3	7
TOTAL	326	35	11

Table 32: Relationship between the total number of calls and the number of women who were threatened with arms by years (SOS line Bar, 2002- 2006)

For the five-year period, there were a total of 326 calls, 11 percent of them reporting threats with arms. Here there is an observable tendency of a decreasing number of calls (chi square is 47.8929 and is statistically significant at 0.01). The number of threats with arms is also decreasing, with the difference in frequencies also being significant (chi square is 14.291, significant at the level 0.001). The greatest number of instances of violence involving the use of arms was recorded in 2003.

¹³ The data were provided by Biljana Pavlović, a volunteer at the SOS line in Bar.



SOS LINE BAR				
YEAR	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN TOTAL NO OF WOMEN THREATENED WITH ARMS			
	f	percent	f	percent
2002	106	33	8	22
2003	85	26	14	40
2004	45	14	7	20
2005	47	14	3	9
2006	43	13	3	9
TOTAL	326	100	35	100

Table 33: Number of women reporting violence and the number of women who were threatened with arms by years (SOS line Bar, 2002- 2006)

Summary:

- Out of a total of 326 calls for the five-year period, 11 percent of women in their stories reported threats with arms;
- The number of calls has decreased over the years;
- The number of threats with arms is also decreasing;
- The most frequent violence against women with the use of arms was recorded in 2003.

6.4.6. SOS Line Ulcinj¹⁴

The Ulcinj SOS line operates in a town with 7,990 women above the age of 15.

The SOS line Ulcinj provided data on:

- Number of women victims of violence;
- Data on perpetrators;
- Number of women threatened with arms;
- Type of weapon used.

	SOS LINE ULCINJ (2002 - 2005)					TOTAL
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
Women who called the SOS line Ulcinj	120	110	85	98	103	516
percent	23	21	16	19	21	100

Table 34: Number of women who called the SOS line Ulcinj (2002- 2006)

In five years, the SOS line Ulcinj had a total of 516 calls, or 103 a year on average. The difference in frequencies of calls per years is not statistically significant (chi square is 6.945).

¹⁴ The data were provided by Mrs Hatidža Nelaj, coordinator of the SOS line in Ulcinj.

Who threatened the women and how many women were threatened?

PERPETRATORS	THREATS WITH ARMS, SOS LINE ULCINJ (2002 – 2005)						TOTAL	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	f	percent	
	f	f	f	F	f	f	percent	
Husband	6	9	5	5	7	32	52	
Father	1		1	1	2	5	8	
Brother	3	1	1	1	3	9	15	
Father-in-law	1		2	1	1	5	8	
Brother-in-law	1	2		2		5	8	
Son		2		2		4	6	
TOTAL	12	14	9	12	13	62		

Table 35: Number of threats with arms and perpetrators

Some 12 percent of women out of the total of 516 were exposed to threats with arms for the whole five-year period. The data on threats with arms by years are given below:

- 2002 – 10 percent;
- 2003 – 13 percent;
- 2004 – 11 percent;
- 2005 - 12 percent;
- 2006 – 10 percent.

The difference in frequencies of threats with arms by years are not statistically significant (chi square test is 1.36263736). The ones who threaten most often are husbands (52 percent), brothers (15 percent), then other relatives.

What types of weapon were used?

TYPE OF ARMS	TYPE OF ARMS – SOS LINE ULCINJ					TOTAL	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	f	percent
Pistol	4	6	3	9	6	28	47
Hunting rifle	3	5	2	1	2	13	22
Knife	5	2	4	1	5	17	29
Bomb		1				1	2
TOTAL	12	14	9	11	13	59	100

Table 36: Types of weapon used in threats (SOS line Ulcinj, 2002 – 2006)

Chi square test calculated between the frequencies referring to the types of arms is 195.866 and is significant at the level of 001. It appears that pistols are the most widely used arms (47 percent), then knives (29 percent) and hunting rifles.

The most common reasons for threats according to women are:

- Refusal to divorce;
- Interference with the choice of a spouse;
- Alcoholism and drug abuse;



- Economic abuse;
- Children taken away by husband's family;
- Forced into begging;
- Extra-uterine pregnancy;
- A relation with a partner of a different religious or ethnic background.

Summary:

- Some 12 percent of the total number of 516 women were exposed to threats with arms over the whole five-year period;
- It is husbands who threaten most often (52 percent), then brothers (15 percent), and other family members;
- From this data pistols are the most readily accessible arms (47 percent), then knives (29 percent), then hunting rifles.

6.4.7. SOS Line Bijelo Polje¹⁵

The data provided by the NGO SOS line Bijelo Polje cover the period from June 2004, when this organisation started operating in this town with 19,652 women above the age of 15. The data provided concern the total number of women who survived violence in various forms and the number of women who were threatened with arms. Unfortunately, there are no data on arms used (Table 37).

How many calls there were and how many women reported being threatened with arms?

YEAR	SOS LINE BIJELO POLJE		
	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN REPORTING VIOLENCE	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN THREATENED WITH ARMS	
	f	f	percent
2004- from June	41	8	20
2005	42	3	7
2006	33	4	12
TOTAL	116	15	13

Table 37: Comparison between the number of women reporting violence and the number of women who were threatened with arms by year (SOS line Bijelo Polje)

Taking into account the results concerning the whole three-year period, 13 percent out of the total number of women (116) has experienced violence where arms were used.

YEAR	SOS LINE BIJELO POLJE			
	TOTAL NO OF WOMEN REPORTING VIOLENCE		TOTAL NO OF WOMEN THREATENED WITH ARMS	
	f	percent	f	percent
2004- from June	41	35	8	53
2005	42	36	3	20
2006	33	29	4	27
TOTAL	116	100	15	100

Table 38: The number of women reporting violence and the number of women who were threatened with arms by year (SOS line Bijelo Polje)

¹⁵ The data were provided by Snežana Dulović, volunteer of the SOS line in Bijelo Polje.

As for the frequency of seeking help from the SOS line by year, there are no significant differences (chi square test is 1.370 and is not statistically significant). If we consider the number of women who were threatened with arms for the same period, for each year separately, again the difference is not statistically significant (chi square test is 2.708 and is not significant).

Summary:

- Taking into account the results concerning the whole three-year period, 13 percent of the total number of women (116) suffered violence involving the use of arms;
- As for the frequency of seeking help from the SOS line, there are no significant differences across the years, nor a difference in the number of women who were threatened with arms.

7. Records of the NGO “Safe House for Women” in Podgorica¹⁶

The NGO “Safe House for Women” in Podgorica does not have available:

- The data on the number of women placed within the shelter. They record persons (both women and children) and it is recorded as admittance: an admittance of one woman or a woman with one or more children;
- Threats with arms are not recorded, and are learned about only through spontaneous women’s stories. Women are never asked the question of possible threat with arms. When asked about the reason why in their interviews they do not ask about threats with arms, the volunteers of the women’s shelter, as was the case with the volunteers operating at SOS lines, say that one of the principles guiding their interviews is not to ask direct questions.

The data obtained from the NGO “Safe House for Women” concern the following:

- Overview of global data on victims of domestic violence seeking help from this non-governmental organisation from 1999 to 2004;
- Overview of results of surveys with victims of violence who turned to the NGO “Safe House for Women” in Podgorica, either directly or by phone, includes 1,500 cases (done in March 2007);
- Number of persons placed within the women’s shelter from 1999 to 2006 in total and for each year separately.

Overview of global data on victims of domestic violence who sought help from the women’s shelter from 1999 to 2004 (made in March 2007)

- From 3rd August 1999 to 30th March 2007, a total of 2,027 people stayed at the shelter of the “Safe House for Women”. The length of their stay varied from one day to 18 months.
- The people seeking shelter come from all social structures and different ethnic backgrounds.
- 173 victims came from refugee camps.
- 49 women with children were refugees living outside camps.
- 35 victims were from Serbia and came at the recommendation of various women’s NGOs or having heard of the shelter in the media.
- Four were refugees from Bosnia and Croatia.
- Seven women were victims of violence from Germany.
- An Austrian woman, a Swedish woman and a Slovenian woman sought assistance from the shelter.
- A three-member family from Mongolia under constant threat from the mother’s ex-husband came to the shelter via humanitarian organisations.

¹⁶ These data were provided by the NGO “Safe House for Women”, from Mrs Mira Saveljić.



- 62 single mothers sought shelter; some of them heavily pregnant.
- 1,759 persons sought help via the phone.

All in all, there were 1,802 persons from Montenegro who stayed for a while within the “Safe House for Women”.

Overview of results of the survey of victims of violence seeking help from the NGO “Safe House for Women” in Podgorica, either directly or via the phone – 1,500 cases covered

According to the data of the women’s shelter, out of 1,500 surveyed women, 75 percent of them belonged to the age group 18-40, 15 percent from the age group 41-60, and 10 percent from the age group 65 to 80.¹⁷ The oldest woman seeking help was 82. These data are shown in Table 39 below.

SURVEY COVERING 1,500 WOMEN WHO SOUGHT HELP FROM THE WOMEN'S SHELTER		
AGE		
18 - 40	41 - 65	65 - 80
75 percent	15 percent	10 percent

Table 39: Age structure of surveyed women

When it comes to the regions that surveyed women came from, almost half of them belonged to the region of Podgorica (42 percent), as might have been expected since Podgorica is by far the largest town in Montenegro. The table below shows regional distribution of all surveyed women.

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN	PERCENT
Podgorica with its surroundings	42
Northern region (Bijelo Polje, Berane, Pljevlja, Rožaje, Plav, Gusinje)	28
Southern region (Sutomore, Bar, Ulcinj)	18
Southern region (Budva, Kotor, Tivat , Herceg Novi)	12
TOTAL	100

Table 40: Regional distribution of surveyed women

There is an obvious absence of the municipalities of Nikšić and Cetinje, leading to the question of whether any victim of violence came to the shelter from these towns?

The data concerning the employment status of these women are given in the Table 41 below.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF SURVEYED WOMEN	PERCENT
No permanent employment (grey economy, non-registered employment, no social security nor health insurance)	49
Permanent employment (non-economy, trade, hospitality industry, health sector, education sector – low incomes)	26
Have never been employed (call themselves housewives)	15
TOTAL	100

Table 40: Employment status of surveyed women

The Table depicts the basic uncertainty of these women (49 percent). Even employed women have low incomes (25 percent).

- 68 percent of women do not believe in trade unions.
- 12 percent of women are members of some political party.

¹⁷ Such age groups were defined by the researchers of the “Safe Home for Women”.

Below are some features concerning the violence women from this sample experienced:

- 90 percent of victims were threatened with arms;
- 42 percent of women were exposed to violence on a daily basis;
- 55 percent of women said they suffered violence from their in-laws as well;
- In 60 percent of the cases children were directly or indirectly exposed to violence;
- In 75 percent of the cases, violence started immediately upon marriage or shortly afterwards;
- 68 percent of victims were exposed to violence during pregnancy as well;
- 13 percent of victims suffered violence from their sons;
- 29 percent of victims were exposed to violence from their husband and son at the same time;
- 38 percent of women believed alcohol to be the cause of violence;
- 71 percent of victims say that their partner beats them with no reason;
- In 11 percent of the cases jealousy is the cause of violence;
- 54 percent of women were victims of marital rape. Asked whether they were raped in marriage, most of the victims gave negative answers (98 percent); however, when the question was rephrased into “Did you have sexual intercourse with your spouse against your will?”, 98 percent of women gave an affirmative answer. This points to a fact that victims are unaware of their rights within marriage;
- 12 percent of women were raped by familiar persons (these women never reported the rape);
- 8 percent of women reported rape with the support of their families;
- 4 percent of women reported rape without the approval of their families;
- In 80 percent of cases, the victim did not have their family’s support to leave the violent partner, not even the support of their mothers, whose comments were typically patriarchal (“I suffered even worse than you do”, “A wife belongs with her husband”, “You cannot come over to our place, you’re married, it’s a disgrace”...there is no one to support you...who’s going to feed the children...you may come, but not “his” children...you got what you asked for...put up with it, it’s not going to last for ever, he’s going to get old...he loves you, but that’s what men are like...there’s nothing you can do about it, you have to listen to the head of the house...just put up with it....);
- 64 percent of women had a violent father, brother, mother in their family;
- 90 percent of women said they were never given proper help from state institutions, police, centres for social work, secretariats for labour and social policy, health care, and education. The cooperation with the police has been greatly improved after educational seminars organised by the “Safe House for Women”;
- 70 percent of women were not informed of the existence of legal aid with municipal courts;
- 100 percent of women were victims of psychological violence and verbal abuse;
- 36 percent of women never reported the violence to the police;
- 41 percent of women reported violence to the police on several occasions;
- 13 percent of women said they were prevented by other family members to report violence;
- 22 percent of women contemplated suicide;
- 9 percent of women inflicted wounds on themselves;
- 2 percent of women were forced to have sexual intercourse with someone their husband brought over to the house;
- 27 percent of victims said the perpetrator participated in the war and owned arms. Violence was intensified after their return from war;

- 38 percent of women suffered violence during the divorce procedure. The partner tried to prevent her leaving him and to control her with violence;
- 0.4 percent of victims suffer domestic violence due to their sexual orientation (lesbian);
- 66 percent of women said the perpetrator himself was once a victim of violence by close family members and that this violent behaviour is legitimate;
- 82 percent of women believed violence to be their private problem;
- 37 percent of women believe somebody else (instead of her) should report violence, since after reporting it the violence only intensifies;
- 32 percent of women did not tell anyone where they were because “it is shameful to be in the shelter”;
- 44 percent of women returned to the perpetrator several times;
- 31 percent of women return to the shelter several times;
- 2 percent of children came to the shelter alone, without their mothers;
- 42 percent of women asked for division of property in parallel with the divorce;
- 8 percent of women returned to the perpetrator after divorce;
- 11 percent of women, after the divorce, found a new partner who is violent;
- 13 percent of women are from abroad;
- 76 percent of women had some ailment (blood circulatory system, tumours, stomach, internal excretion glands, improper nutrition, disturbed metabolisms, dizziness, headache, faintness.)

Number of persons housed within the Safe House for Women from 1999 to 2006, total and by years

Regrettably, here the figures include all persons staying at the shelter, both women and children. The data are shown in Table 41 below.

YEAR	NO OF PERSONS STAYING AT THE SAFE HOUSE FOR WOMEN (1999 – 2006)	
	F	PERCENT
1999	56	3
2000	227	11
2001	260	13
2002	290	14
2003	335	17
2004	350	17
2005	400	20
2006	109	5
TOTAL	2027	100

Table 41: Number of persons staying at the Safe House for Women (1999 – 2006)

Analysis

These data speak of the multilayered issue of domestic violence and women and children as victims. The data clearly show how complicated the cycle of violence is: the age and social insecurity of the victim, unemployment or employment not securing social security, the family context within the primary and secondary family of the victim. The primary families, most of all the mothers with their messages to their daughters do not only fail to provide assistance for the violence to end, but even support the passive and silent position of the victim, in spite of the fact that the victim was their own child. Furthermore, the expectation of being labelled as a victim prevents women from responding properly to put an end to violence, and even when that happens, they do not wish to

talk about it. The community at large, according to these women, failed to provide proper and safe protection measures within public institutions, so that even if she decides to disclose violence, the victim is caught between the risk of renewed violence and an embarrassing situation. Things are complicated further still, given existing attitudes towards victims of violence.

According to these data, in 90 percent of cases women are exposed to threats with weapons and this is just the tip of the iceberg of domestic violence. Unfortunately, there is no detailed information on how many instances, when and with what type of weapon these women were threatened, neither on which of the family members exercised threats, although, considering that in 80 percent of the cases the perpetrators were their partners, it is only logical to believe that they are the ones with the weapons in their hands.

8. Records of the NGO Montenegrin Women's Lobby¹⁸

The data refer to the period 2004 to 2007 (or the first five months this year).

YEAR	RESIDENTS OF THE SHELTER FOR TRAFFICKED WOMEN											
	AGE											
	15 - 19		20 - 24		25 -30		31 - 35		36 - 40		TOTAL	
	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent	f	percent
2007 (5 months)	1	14	3	43	2	29			1	14	7	100
2006	2	29	1	14	1	14	1	14	2	29	7	100
2005	8	40	6	30	3	15	2	10	1	5	20	100
2004	3	60					1	20	1	20	5	
TOTAL	14	36	10	26	6	15	4	10	5	13	39	100

Table 42: Age structure of residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women between 2004 and 2007

Thus, from 2004 to 2007, or the first five months of 2007, a total of 39 women stayed at the Shelter for Trafficked Women in Podgorica. Most often these were very young girls, aged 15-19 (36 percent), then 26 percent from the age group 20-24. There were 15 percent women from the age group 25-30, 10 percent between 31 and 35 years of age, and 13 percent from 36 to 40 years of age.

Minors at the shelter:

YEAR	MINOR GIRLS AT THE SHELTER FOR TRAFFICKED WOMEN						
	AGE						
	13	14	15	16	17	18	TOTAL
2007(5 months)			1				1
2006					1	1	2
2005	1		6	1			8
2004					1		1
TOTAL	1		7	1	2	1	12

Table 43: Minor residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women from 2004 to 2007

The age group 15-19 or younger included altogether 12 girls, the youngest being 13, and most of them being 15-year-olds (seven).

¹⁸ The data were obtained from Mrs Aida Petrovic – Montenegrin Women's lobby.

The following table shows the nationality of residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women:

YEAR	DOMICILE OF RESIDENTS OF THE SHELTER FOR TRAFFICKED WOMEN					
	DOMESTIC NATIONALS		FOREIGN NATIONALS		TOTAL	
	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT
2007 (5 months)	2	29	5	71	7	100
2006	2	29	5	71	7	100
2005	4	20	16	80	20	100
2004	1	20	4	80	5	100
TOTAL	9	23	30	77	39	100

Table 44: Domicile of residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women from 2004 to 2007

As the above Table shows, from 2004 to end May 2007, most of the residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women in Podgorica were foreign nationals (77 percent).

A comment from the NGO Montenegrin Women's Lobby:

All residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women spoke of some form of threat with arms by their pimp, clients, even the staff of the establishment where they were forced to provide sexual services. Threats with arms are quite common, as our residents say: if women refuse to work with clients, if they fail to earn a certain amount of money, if they are unkind to the pimp, to clients, to people from the establishment, the women are subject to various threats, blackmails and even threats with arms. Residents said pimps would often use as "help" to break their disobedience the consummation of a large quantity of alcohol or various drugs with the use of force and the threat of firearms. Five residents out of the total number of them reported that when crossing different borders they also had to carry smaller quantities of arms and ammunition as per their pimp's orders. All statements of the residents were given voluntarily, without interrogation by the activists of the shelter.

Summary:

- From 2004 to 2007, or the first five months this year, a total of 39 women stayed at the Shelter for Trafficked Women in Podgorica;
- Most often, these were young girls aged 15 to 19;
- The age group 15-19 or younger included 12 minors, the youngest being 13, and most of them being 15-year-olds (7);
- Most of the residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women in Podgorica were foreign nationals (77 percent).

9. "Women's Crime Pages 2005" – analysis of daily papers "Pobjeda", "Republika" and "Dan" in 2005, done by Lidija Tomažević - NGO "Anima" – Kotor

After one year of media monitoring aimed at following women's "roles" in the articles published, the so-called crime pages of the above dailies, and the author, in order to provide for more objective monitoring of the results, observes:

- "Although it would be logical, at least in the case of crime pages for all the dailies to cover the same information, the results of the analysis do not confirm this";
- "Dan" published the greatest number of articles on trafficking and the largest number of articles on a case never even mentioned by "Pobjeda";

- Within the category “rape and attempted rape” “Pobjeda” published articles on 11 cases happening within Montenegro and 13 in Serbia, while “Dan” in its reporting on the same criminal offences covered 18 cases in Montenegro and 1 in Serbia.¹⁹

The papers in 2005 reported on:

- Current events, those from 2005;
- Court proceedings on criminal offences from the period 2000-2005, or even earlier;
- The share of “backlog” cases varies from 32 percent according to “Dan” to 43 percent according to “Republika”;
- The analysis covered some 648 articles and altogether some 300 cases reported about in all three dailies in 2005, out of which 205 happened within Montenegro (68 percent);
- Within the so-called crime pages, women appeared as victims in over 90 percent of the cases.

Analysis of daily newspapers concerning the use of arms in gender-based violence

In order to gather information relevant for the objectives of this survey, the monitoring of the given dailies included the following:

- Number of events covering gender-based violence in Montenegro;
- Use of SALW in these instances.

It is very difficult to follow these data since the dailies published information concerning events happening both in Montenegro and in Serbia (State Union) and data from articles are not always adequate to enable certain conclusions about events happening in Montenegro.

General data on press reporting:

POBJEDA				
CRIMINAL OFFENCES ²⁰	PERIODS		TOTAL CASES	TOTAL ARTICLES
	2005	2000-2005		
TRAFFICKING	9	6	15	40
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	8	8	16	31
MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER	13	4	17	26
RAPE AND ATTEMPTED RAPE	18	7	25	35
ILLEGAL ACTS (WOMEN PERPETRATORS) ²¹	16		16	25
INFANTICIDE AND CHILD NEGLECT	6		6	6
“ODD CASES” ²²	17		17	35
TOTAL	87	25	112	198
percent	78	22	100	

Table 45: Overview of articles and the number of “women’s roles” in relation to criminal offences published in the daily “Pobjeda” in 2005

¹⁹ This monitoring was done while the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro was still in existence.

²⁰ The table shows the division made by the author herself.

²¹ Illegal acts – drug sale, participation in thefts, frauds, tax frauds, money counterfeiting, and violation of the right to information.

²² Attempted abduction and actual abduction of boys, suicide, deaths under suspicious circumstances, occurrences.

As the above table shows, in 2005 the daily “Pobjeda” published 195 articles on 112 cases of various forms of violence. Out of this number, 78 percent of cases occurred in 2005, and 22 percent concerned court proceedings from previous years.

It is only the section on murder and attempted murder that contains data on the use of arms in violence. The data are quite uncertain and only say that in just over half of murders and suicides firearms were used, while the rest involved cold weapons (knives) and tools (hammers, bars).

These are the only data of arms in this overview made on the basis of newspaper articles. In order to provide for a better overview of the situation of violence against women from this perspective, we will present also the data from the remaining two dailies regardless of the fact that they do not contain data on arms.

The following analysis concerns the same daily, and Table 45 shows the frequency of cases considering the type of criminal offence and their territorial origin to approach the data characteristic for the area of Montenegro.

CRIMINAL OFFENCES	POBJEDA				TOTAL F
	WITHIN MONTENEGRO		IN SERBIA AND NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES		
	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	
Trafficking	15	17			15
Domestic violence	8	9	8	9	16
Murder and attempted murder	11	12	6	7	17
Rape and attempted rape	11	12	14	16	25
Illegal acts (women perpetrators)	15	17	1	1	16
TOTAL	60		29		89
percent	67	67	33	33	100

Table 46: Frequency of criminal cases within Montenegro compared to neighbouring countries

Out of the total number of cases monitored in “Pobjeda” in 2005, 67 percent happened within Montenegro. It was not possible to present some categories, such as murder and attempted murder, or rape and attempted rape, more precisely (e.g. just murders or attempted murders since the source of information does not separate them according to the area where they occurred).

The following tables refer to the daily “Republika”.

CRIMINAL OFFENCES ²³	REPUBLIKA			
	PERIODS		TOTAL CASES	TOTAL ARTICLES
	2005	2000-2005		
TRAFFICKING	13		13	40
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	12	7	19	40
MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER	5	8	13	35
RAPE AND ATTEMPTED RAPE	18	12	30	35
ILLEGAL ACTS (WOMEN PERPETRATORS)				
INFANTICIDE AND CHILD NEGLECT	3		3	3
MURDER FOR GAIN	2	3	5	25
“ODD CASES”	14		14	20
TOTAL	67	30	97	198
percent	69	31	100	

Table 47: Overview of the number of articles and “women’s roles” compared to criminal offences reported in the daily “Republika” in 2005

The daily newspaper “Republika” published 198 articles covering 100 cases of various forms of violence. A total of 69 percent of cases occurred in 2005, while 31 percent referred to pending court proceedings.

The following table shows the data on the number of offences occurring within Montenegro.

CRIMINAL OFFENCES	REPUBLIKA				TOTAL F
	WITHIN MONTENEGRO		SERBIA AND NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES		
	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	
TRAFFICKING	7	7	6	6	13
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	11	11	8	8	19
MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER	12	12	1	1	13
RAPE AND ATTEMPTED RAPE	15	15	15	15	30
INFANTICIDE	2	2	1	1	3
MURDER FOR GAIN	5	5	5	5	10
“ODD CASES”	14	14		14	14
TOTAL	66		36		102
percent	65	66	35	35	100

Table 48: Frequency of criminal cases within Montenegro compared to neighbouring countries

Out of 100 cases, 65 percent occurred in Montenegro.

The tables below show articles published by the daily “Dan”.

CRIMINAL OFFENCES ²⁴	DAN			
	PERIODS		TOTAL CASES	TOTAL ARTICLES
	2005	2000-2005		
TRAFFICKING	8	8	16	70
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	7	7	14	35
MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER	11	6	17	30
RAPE AND ATTEMPTED RAPE	15	5	20	36
ILLEGAL ACTS (WOMEN PERPETRATORS)	14		14	20
INFANTICIDE AND CHILD NEGLECT	2		2	3
MURDER FOR GAIN	2	3	5	16
ABDUCTIONS AND ATTEMPTED ABDUCTIONS	6		6	13
QUACKERY	2		2	4
“ODD CASES”	12		12	25
TOTAL	79	29	108	252
percent	73	27	100	

Table 49: Overview of the number of articles and “women’s roles” compared to criminal offences reported in the daily “Dan” in 2005

In 2005 the daily “Dan” published 252 articles reporting on 100 cases of violence, 75 percent of which occurred during the given year.

How many of these crimes happened in Montenegro?

CRIMINAL OFFENCES	DAN				
	MONTENEGRO		SERBIA AND NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES		TOTAL
	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	F
TRAFFICKING	1	6	15	94	16
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	11	79	3	21	14
MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER	15	88	2	12	17
RAPE AND ATTEMPTED RAPE	18	90	2	10	20
ILLEGAL ACTS	1	50	1	50	2
INFANTICIDE	2	100			2
MURDER FOR GAIN	5	100			5
ABDUCTIONS AND ATTEMPTED ABDUCTIONS	6	100			6
QUACKERY	1	50	1	50	2
“ODD CASES”	12	100			12
TOTAL	72		24		96
percent	75		25		100

Table 50: Frequency of criminal cases within Montenegro compared to the surrounding

Thus, according to “Dan”, 75 percent of criminal offences occurred in Montenegro.

Conclusion:

- The given material did not provide more specific information regarding the use of arms in gender-based violence, since there is no clear distinction made between the cases occurring in Montenegro and in neighbouring countries;
- One important piece of information, though, is that of the total of 300 reported cases of victims of violence, 90percent were women;
- The data on the use of arms are not adequate to be able to offer any concrete conclusions.

10. SALW Overview – Articles Published in the Daily “Vijesti” 2003, Aleksandar Pajević, Montenegro Media Institute

The articles published in daily papers were analysed from the point of view of gender differences of participants in domestic conflicts involving the use of SALW.

In the given year (2003), from January to November, “Vijesti” published 202 articles reporting on conflicts between people involving the use of small arms. Out of these, 23 (11 percent) refer to the involvement of women where small arms were used in violent and non-violent events, and there was the same proportion of women who were victims.

DAILY “VIJESTI” 2003							
WOMEN		MEN		UNKNOWN		TOTAL	
F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT	F	PERCENT
23	7	296	80	51	13	370	100

Table 51: Women and men victims of SALW in 2003 (“Vijesti”)

According to the data in Table 50 concerning the participants in these events, 7 percent were women, 20 percent were men, and 14 percent of participants are of unknown gender.

DAILY "VIJESTI" 2003									
MONTH	VICTIMS			PERPETRATORS			TOTAL		
	W	M	U	W	M	U	F	PERCENT	
January	2	12			22	7	43	12	
February		12		1	9	14	36	10	
March	4	23			13	13	53	14	
April	1	12			14	4	31	8	
May	3	13			15		31	8	
June	1	10			17		29	8	
July		10			14		24	6	
August	3	8	12		14		37	10	
September	1	7			13		21	6	
October	1	10			15		26	7	
November	4	12		1	21	1	39	11	
TOTAL	21	129	12	2	167	39	370	100	
percent	6	34	3	1	45	11		100	

Table 52: Male – Female roles as victim and perpetrator ("Vijesti", 2003)

This table shows how often men and women are victims or perpetrators and an annual distribution of incidents. The victims of violence or occurrences where small arms were used are 6 percent women and 34 percent men, while 3 percent are of unknown gender. Thus, at least 43 percent²⁵ were victims in these records of events. According to the same data, one percent of people behaving violently using small arms were women (two women), 45 percent were men and 11 percent were people of unknown gender.

As for the features of events, let us single out here only the most characteristic ones, important for gender-based violence occurring in a family or partner relations.

RELATION	TYPE OF INCIDENT	TYPE OF ARMS	F	PERCENT
Partner relation	A young man first killed his girlfriend with three shots and then took his own life.	Pistol	1	
	Threatening with a pistol, a boy abducted a girl.	Pistol	1	
	Killed a common law wife with a knife. Tried to kill a common law wife who he first injured with a knife.	Knife	1	
Marital relations	A husband killed a wife who put herself in front of the gun to prevent him shooting in a café.	Rifle	1	
	Attempted murder of his wife.	Knife	1	
Mother – son	Tried to kill own mother with a pistol while she was sleeping, and she remained slightly wounded.	Pistol	1	
	Son killed his mother with several stabs with a kitchen knife.	Kitchen knife	1	
Total			7	30 percent

Table 53: 2003 events involving gender-based violence (Vijesti, 2003)

²⁵ Some articles just say "several persons".



As may be seen, 30 percent (of the total number of women participants to cases reported by “Vijesti”) got hurt in family relations and serious criminal offences.

Conclusion: Such data fit the general trend regarding violence in male-female relations.

11. SUMMARY

- The data obtained from the Police Directorate in Podgorica for the year 2006 show that in Montenegro 49 women were victims of criminal offences against life and physical integrity. Fourteen per cent were victims of firearms. There are no data on the type of arms.
- Reviewing the data obtained from the SOS Line for women and children victims of violence in Montenegro (eight), it is noticeable that such data is not uniform, neither regarding the time period they refer to nor the information. It seems that the most reliable piece of information that may be followed in all the data is the total number of women seeking help from the SOS line and the number of women stating threats of arms they were exposed to, with the exception of the SOS line Plav, which failed to provide such data.

The following table shows the share of women giving this piece of information:

MUNICIPALITY	SHARE OF WOMEN THREATENED BY ARMS (PERCENT)
Rožaje	20
Berane	19
Podgorica	15
Bijelo Polje	13
Ulcinj	12
Bar	11
Nikšić	4
Plav	No data

Table 54: Share of women exposed to threats of arms

- The second piece of information available from all sources was the gender of persons behaving violently. With the exception of Podgorica, where 97 percent of men and 3 percent of women behaved violently, in all other municipalities only men were recorded as perpetrators. Considering the sources, most often the perpetrators are husbands and ex-husbands, then other relatives and men women have personal relations with. The data from Ulcinj are characteristic: there is a considerable percentage of brothers (15 percent) who behave violently towards their sisters. Women from Podgorica had the greatest range of relations in which they suffered violence, while in Berane only husbands and children were violent towards women.
- In all towns women were most often exposed to firearm threats. It seems that pistols are the most readily available type of weapon, with the exception of Nikšić and Berane where victims were exposed to threats with a knife.
- In the majority of municipalities there are no considerable differences in the frequency of reporting violence, considering the years within the observed period. The only exception is Bar, where their reporting has decreased and Rožaje where the number of women reporting violence has increased.
- According to the data of the Safe House for Women, in 90 percent of the cases women were exposed to threats with arms, but this remains but a tip of the iceberg of domestic violence. Unfortunately there are no more precise data on how many, when and what types of arms were used to threaten these women, just as is the case with the data referring to what members of their families threatened them, although, considering the fact that in 80 percent of the cases perpetrators were their partners, it would be only logical to expect that it was this group that most often used weapons to threaten victims.

- **Shelter for Trafficked Women** from 2004 to 2007 (for the first five months of this year), provided shelter to 39 trafficked women. Most of them were very young girls, aged 15-19. This group included 12 minor girls, the youngest among them being not more than 13 years old, and the largest number of them being 15 year olds (seven). Most of the residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women in Podgorica were foreign nationals (77 percent). There are no precise data on armed threats. The following is a comment from the shelter coordinator: *All residents of the Shelter for Trafficked Women spoke of some form of armed threats by their pimps, by the clients and even the staff of the establishments where they were forced to provide sexual services.*
- **The daily newspapers “Pobjeda”, “Republika” and “Dan” (2005)** – relevant for gender-based violence is the single piece of information obtained by reviewing the articles covering a total of 300 case, where in 90 percent of cases women were victims of violence.
- **The daily “Vijesti” (2003)** gives information that fits into the general trend when it comes to male-female relations.

Recommendations

Taking into account the data on gender-based violence involving small arms, three areas for action appear to be significant in the sense of prevention and control:

- Reduce the presence of small arms and thus their availability;
- Build family protection mechanisms and services; and
- A comprehensive multi-sectoral work model to protect women against violence.



Annex A – Attitudes towards Arms and Gender Differences

Leading questions for discussions:

Do you think there are any reasons why young people should own arms?

- In the discussion prompted by this question there was no difference between boys and girls. They all believe there are no reasons to motivate them to own arms. (Focus group, children 13 – 14 years of age.)
- There are no differences in views over this issue between boys and girls. They all believe that there are no reasons why young should be allowed to own arms. (Focus group, young people aged 15 – 18.)
- All fathers and mothers of elementary school children agree that the young have no reason to hold arms and leave the possibility for themselves to decide once they are adults. (Focus group, parents of children aged 13-15.)
- All parents of secondary school children (both groups) believe that “the young should not be oriented towards arms”, i.e. there are no differences between fathers and mothers. (Focus group, parents of secondary school children)

Do you believe adults may have a reason to keep arms in their homes?

- Comments to this question show male-female differences. Most of the girls believe that there are no reasons to own arms, and most of the boys do find reasons why adults should own arms (if it is legally owned, out of the reach of children, for defence, small pistol, in case of self-defence...). The reasons similar to the ones given by the boys may also be noted in the discussions of girls who believe adults should own arms. (Focus group, children 13 – 14 years of age.)
- Girls’ main reasons for justifying possession of arms are tradition, sport and collecting arms. Defence and security in case of danger are the reasons most noticeable in the responses of boys. (Focus group, young people aged 15 – 18.)
- Mothers of children of primary school age have a negative attitude towards owning arms, with the exception of arms for sporting purposes. (Focus group, parents of children aged 13-15.)
- Within one group of parents all mothers of children of secondary school age are positive about seeing no reason for owning arms. The fathers are more ambivalent. Some fathers agree with the mothers, while others believe arms should be kept in the house at least as a trophy. The second group of parents discuss fathers on the topic and they are explicitly against keeping arms in their own homes. (Focus group, parents of secondary school children).

Is there any reason for young people to carry some type of arm in their daily life?

- Within this discussion there are no major differences between girls and boys, although boys more often than girls find reasons why a young person may carry arms (sport, threats, revenge). The same reasons are given by the girls in favour of the young carrying arms. (Focus group, children 13-14 years of age.)
- Girls are positive that there are no reasons due to which the young should carry weapons. Boys are more reserved and less clear and give examples from their daily lives where arms were used. (Focus group of young people aged 15-18.)
- Fathers have a negative attitude towards young people carrying arms, as are mothers, who have a more pronounced negative attitude. (Focus group, parents of children aged 13-15.)

- All fathers and all mothers are very explicit in saying that there are no reasons for young people to carry arms in their daily lives. (Focus group, parents of secondary school children.)

Do adults have any reason to carry arms in their daily lives?

- Girls in general believe that adults have no reason to carry arms in daily life, as is the opinion of a smaller share of boys. Most of the boys believe that by carrying guns one may protect oneself from violence, vengeance or any danger in general. (Focus group, children 13 – 14 years of age.)
- There are no comments from men in the discussion prompted by this question. Girls are clear that there is no reason for adults to carry guns in daily life. (Focus group, young people aged 15 – 18.)
- Both mothers and fathers believe that there is no reason whatsoever for young people to carry arms. (Focus group, parents of children aged 13-15.)
- In one group all the parents regardless of their sex, believe that there is no reason to carry arms in daily life. In the second group mothers are of such opinion, while fathers believe that security is a reason for carrying arms. (Focus group, parents of secondary school children.)

What motivates young people to use arms?

- The discussion of boys and girls prompted by this question was very interesting. Boys believe that the imitation of role models and influences from their surroundings may be the main reasons why young people use arms, as well as gang conflicts and revenge. For girls the dominant reason is vengeance and the feeling of being “looked down upon by the society”. (Focus group, children 13 – 14 years of age.)
- The list of reasons (alcohol, drugs, defence and self-defence, vengeance and family influences) stated by the girls is almost no different than the list of reasons stated by boys. For boys the use of arms also means a confirmation of virility. Opinion is that the use of arms increases their masculinity. (Focus group of young people aged 15 – 18.)
- Fathers stated several important reasons which may incite young people to use arms: “to prove oneself, drug abuse, alcohol” as well as the influence of the media and lack of good communication with parents. Mothers state immaturity of the young and the presence of arms at home as a very important fact, as well as the impact of the media. (Focus group, parents of children aged 13-15.)
- All parents believe (both groups) that there should be no reason for young people to use arms. (Focus group, parents of secondary school children.)

What motivates adults to use arms?

- As one of the reasons for adults to use arms, boys and girls stated “when it is needed to protect their children”. All other reasons are similar and refer to deviant behaviour and loss of control. (Focus group, children 13 – 14 years of age.)
- For boys the reasons are linked to defence, self-defence, vengeance or alcohol, and for girls, in addition to these, criminal activities, proving oneself and drug abuse. (Focus group, young people aged 15 – 18.)
- Only men spoke on the topic. Fathers believe that the presence of arms is one of the decisive reasons that may incite somebody to use arms. The second group of answers concern various consequences of crisis in the society. (Focus group, parents of children aged 13-15.)
- Fathers in both groups prevalingly believe that political reasons, vengeance, as well as diversities, or conflicts between different groups may be a reason to use arms, while the women of one group are more inclined to believe that lack of tolerance among people is the factor that has the largest influence on the possibility of using arms. Mothers of the other group did not give their opinions on the issue. (Focus group, parents of secondary school children.)



Annex B – SOS Line Podgorica – Data Analysis 2002 - 2007

2002 Data

Incidents involving armed threats and the type of arms used:

Handgun threat:

1. Threatening with service pistol and attempted murder of a wife by her husband;
2. Pistol threat by son (alcoholism) to his mother and sister;
3. Jealous husband (alcoholism) threatened his wife's colleagues with a handgun;
4. Pistol threat to a woman by her partner;
5. Father threatening the whole family with a pistol, shooting around the house;
6. Ex husband (alcoholism) threatening his wife with a pistol;
7. Husband threatening his wife with a service pistol (alcoholism).

Bomb threats:

1. Ex-husband (alcoholism) threatening the wife and attempted murder – first pistol, then bomb;
2. A man beat his ex-wife and the daughter and son of a former business partner and threw a bomb in the yard.

Knife threat:

1. Husband (alcoholism, drug addiction) threatened his wife with a knife and tried to kill her;
2. Husband threatened his wife with a knife and attempted murder;
3. Stab wound (husband stabbed his wife).

Cases with no data concerning the type of used firearms:

1. Physical violence of husband against his wife, armed;
2. Physical and psychological violence of husband against his wife and children, armed with duty weapons;
3. Murder threat from a male neighbour against his female neighbour, armed;
4. Murder threat for wife and children (applied for a licence for weapons);
5. Ex-husband threatened the wife and son, armed (treated mental patient);
6. Common-law husband threatening wife, armed – non-licensed weapons (alcoholism and drug abuse);
7. Husband threatening to kill wife and children. Husband holds duty weapons;
8. Physical violence of father-in-law and sons, who were armed, towards the women of the house;
9. Murder threats of common-law husband armed at the time, to his wife and her only brother. This man (alcoholism) spent many years in prison for double homicide, having killed his cousin and his brother.

Murder threat and attempted murder, no data on the use of arms:

1. Husband (alcoholism) threatened wife and attempted murder;
2. Murder threat and attempt to kill wife and children (a mental patient treated for violence and an alcoholic);
3. Son threatened to kill his mother, father and sister (alcoholism and drug addiction of the perpetrator);
4. Husband threatening his wife with murder;
5. Threatening wife and children and attempted murder;
6. Father threatened to kill his daughter;
7. Husband (alcoholism) threatened his wife and children;
8. Husband threatening his wife with murder (jealousy, alcoholism of the perpetrator);
9. Threatening wife and children (alcoholism of the perpetrator – treated mental patient);
10. Threatening wife and children (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
11. Husband threatening his wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
12. Threatening wife and children (alcoholism and mental illness of the perpetrator);
13. Ex-husband threatened his wife and children and attempted murder;
14. Husband threatening his wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
15. Husband threatening to murder his wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
16. Husband threatening to kill his wife and child (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
17. Husband threatening his wife (jealousy, alcoholism of the perpetrator);
18. Ex-husband threatened his wife (treated mental patient);
19. Husband threatening to kill his wife and child (treated mental patient);
20. Repeated threats to kill wife and children (treated mental patient);
21. Son threatened his mother and other family members (drug addiction);
22. Husband alcoholic threatened to kill his wife and children;
23. Jealous husband threatened to kill his wife;
24. Threat to the wife and daughter (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
25. Brother threatened to kill his sister and father (treated mental patient);
26. Husband threatening to kill his wife and child.



2003 Data

Incidents involving arm threats and type of arms used:

Handgun threat:

1. Husband threatening his wife with service pistol (alcoholism, jealousy of the perpetrator);
2. Threat and at the same time attempted murder, first with a knife, then shooting from a pistol. After searching the house, police found seven rifles and three pistols, with the father-in-law taking responsibility for the arms. Problem - alcoholism of the perpetrator.

Rifle threat:

1. Husband threatening to shoot himself with a rifle (lost his job);
2. Threats and shooting from the rifle at the wife and three children.

Knife threat:

1. Husband threatening wife and children with knives (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
2. Wife raised knife to her alcoholic husband in self-defence;
3. Husband threatened and attempted murder of his son and wife with a knife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
4. Threats, then attempted murder with a knife, then a handgun (already stated case);
5. Husband reported his wife for putting the knife under the throat of her children (mentally deranged).

Cases with no data as to the type of firearms used:

1. Mental and physical violence of ex husband against the wife, armed (member of the military, alcoholism);
2. Threat and attempted murder of a wife, husband was armed (children in danger);
3. Murder threats to a woman by ex partner, while he was armed;
4. Physical violence of ex-husband (who was armed) against his wife;
5. Physical violence of armed husband against his wife (jealousy of the perpetrator);
6. Husband threatens with murder, armed (a police officer);
7. Husband threatening to kill his wife, children and himself, armed (police inspector);
8. Husband physically and mentally harassing wife, armed (former policeman, suspended, alcoholic);
9. Husband threatening wife and attempted murder, armed (lieutenant colonel);
10. Threat, physical and mental violence of ex-husband against wife, armed (children in danger, member of the military, alcoholic);
11. Husband threatened his son and wife, attempted murder, armed (children in danger – threats, alcoholic);
12. Husband threatening wife and attempted murder. He was armed.

Threat and attempted murder, no data on the use of arms:

1. Husband alcoholic threatening his wife;
2. Threatening wife with murder;
3. Threatening wife (beating);
4. Husband threatening his wife;
5. Brother threatened to kill his sister and her boyfriend;
6. Husband threatening to kill his wife;
7. Nephew threatened to kill his uncle, aunt and their grandchildren (policeman, legal succession dispute concerning the house);
8. Threatening the wife and the child (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
9. Ex-husband threatened wife and son (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
10. Husband threatening the wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
11. New lover of the mother threatened children;
12. Threatened to kill his wife (perpetrator a public figure, drug addiction);
13. Husband threatened his wife and mother-in-law (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
14. Boyfriend threatened his girlfriend – a student and attempted murder (beating, throwing down the stairs - alcoholism of the perpetrator);
15. Threatening to kill the wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
16. Husband threatening his wife.

2004 Data

Incidents involving arm threats and type of arms used:

Handgun threat:

1. Left husband shooting at his wife and his father-in-law;
2. Husband exercising mental violence with the use of a pistol (barrel in the mouth of the wife);
3. Threats and violence with the use of a pistol against the wife and daughter;
4. Threat and attempted murder by ex-husband against wife and children, armed (alcoholism, treated mental patient);
5. Violent husband threatens with suicide in case that his family would leave him;
6. Husband threatened to kill the wife if she left him and got a divorce.

Knife threat:

1. Mental and physical violence of the husband threatening with a knife (knife kept below the pillow all night).

Cases with no data as to the type of firearms used:

1. Husband threatened to kill the wife and her brothers, armed;
2. Husband threatened to kill the wife and daughter, armed (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
3. Pathological jealousy of the husband of his wife, armed;
4. Husband, alcoholic, threatening the wife and children, armed;
5. Ex-husband and mother-in law threatened to kill the wife/daughter-in-law, armed (alcoholics);
6. Son threatened to kill his mother, not armed himself but father keeps arms within the house;
7. Threatening to kill his wife if she leaves him, armed with a gun (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
8. Threatening to kill the wife and her family.

Threat and attempted murder, no data on the use of arms:

1. Husband who was cheated threatened his wife and her lover;
2. Son threatening his mother (mental patient);
3. Ex-husband threatened ex-wife and child;
4. Threatened to kill his wife (physical and mental abuse of children, alcoholic);
5. Son threatened to kill other members of the family (alcoholism and drug addiction);
6. Husband threatened the members of his wife's family;
7. Threatened to kill his wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
8. Husband threatened to kill his wife (children in danger);
9. Brother-in-law threatened to kill his brother's wife (children in danger);
10. Ex-husband threatening wife and children;
11. Common law husband threatening to kill the wife and her parents;
12. Threatening to kill the wife (children in danger);
13. Son threatening and attempting to kill his mother (alcoholic);
14. Husband threatening the wife and her whole family (alcoholic, child harassment and abduction);
15. Mother-in-law threatened to kill her daughter-in-law (property related disputes);
16. Husband, alcoholic, threatened his wife and children;

17. Ex-husband threatened to kill his wife;
18. Husband threatened to kill his wife (children in danger, alcoholic);
19. Brother-in-law threatened to kill his sister-in-law;
20. Ex-husband threatened his wife (alcoholism of the perpetrator).

2005 Data

Incidents involving arm threats and type of arms used:

Handgun threat:

1. Husband threatened with a pistol to his wife, child and mother-in-law;
2. Husband threatened his wife with a pistol (jealousy, alcoholism);
3. Husband threatened his wife with a pistol, psychological damage to children (jealousy, alcoholism);
4. Husband threatened with a pistol to his wife, child and himself (treated mental patient);
5. Husband threatened his wife with a pistol;
6. Husband threatened with a pistol to his wife, child and himself;
7. Husband threatened his wife with a pistol (battered – concussion);
8. Husband threatened his wife with a pistol (member of the military);
9. Husband threatened his wife with a pistol;
10. Pistol threat of a brother-in-law to his sister-in-law (convicted for 15 years for killing own brother. On return, threatening the sister-in-law and asking for custody over children);
11. Husband threatening with a pistol his wife and children (after beating his four-month-old baby he fled to the USA);
12. Husband beat his wife threatening with a pistol, children in danger;
13. Husband threatening with a pistol his wife and children;
14. Husband threatening his wife with a pistol;
15. Husband beat his wife threatening with a gun (holding duty weapons);
16. Ex-husband threatened with a pistol the wife and children (treated mental patient).

Rifle threat:

1. Son threatened his father with a rifle.

Bomb threat:

1. Husband threatened wife with a bomb;
2. Husband beats his wife, then threatens her with a bomb;

3. Threatening wife and children with a bomb if they “do not obey” (the bomb placed visibly in the house as a constant reminder of what happens if they do not obey).

Knife threat:

1. Son threatened and tried to kill his mother with a knife;
2. Mutual knife threats (husband-wife);
3. Attempted murder with a knife.

Armed, no data on the type of firearms and the use of arms:

1. Attempted murder, physical violence against wife and children, armed;
2. Male cousin threatened to kill the child, armed;
3. Husband threatened his wife, armed;
4. Husband threatened his wife, armed (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
5. Ex-husband threatened to kill the wife and children, armed (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
6. Son threatens to kill mother and sisters, armed (alcoholism of the perpetrator);
7. Husband threatened to kill his wife, armed (member of the military, alcoholism);
8. Common-law husband threatened to kill his wife, armed (alcoholic);
9. Ex-husband threatened wife and children, armed (mental patient).

Threat and attempted murder, no data on the use of arms:

1. Father threatened and attempted to kill his child;
2. Threatened to kill his wife (alcohol issues of the perpetrator, children in danger);
3. Threatened to kill his wife and children (children in danger, alcoholic);
4. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
5. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
6. Male neighbour threatened to kill his female neighbour;
7. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
8. Son threatened to kill his father;
9. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
10. Son threatened to kill his mother (drug abuse of the perpetrator);
11. Drug pushers threatened to kill his mother and brother (elder son – drug addict borrowed money, now his family being threatened);
12. Husband threatening to kill his wife (physical violence, abduction);

13. Threatening to kill wife and children (children in danger, alcoholic);

14. Husband threatening to kill his wife.

2006 Data

Incidents involving armed threats and type of arm used:

Handgun threat:

1. Husband threatened and attempted to kill his wife by a pistol (children in danger, alcohol problem);
2. Husband tried to kill his wife with a pistol;
3. Threatened and tried to kill the wife with a pistol;
4. Threatening with a pistol, beat his wife and mother-in-law;
5. Threatened with a pistol, beat his wife;
6. Male threatening with a pistol, abducted child;
7. Husband threatening with a pistol, took two children and forced the wife to go back to violent marriage.

Cases of the use of pistol with tragic consequences – death:

1. Threatening with a pistol, beat wife and mother-in-law and mother-in-law died as a result.

Bomb threat:

1. Bomb threat;
2. Bomb threat of the husband and his family to the wife;
3. Bomb threat to the wife's family.

Knife threat:

1. Threatening to kill wife with a knife (alcohol problem);
2. Tried to kill her husband with a knife and her daughter-in-law with an axe (a mentally deranged woman).

Armed, no data on the type of firearms and the use of arms:

1. Husband threatened his wife, armed;
2. Attempted murder, physical and psychological violence of the husband against his wife, armed (jealousy);
3. Armed brother threatened to kill his brother-in-law (sister's husband) and his family if they do not stop harassing his sister.

Threat or attempted murder, no data as to the use of firearms:

1. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
2. Husband threatened to kill wife and children, use of knife (alcohol problem);

3. Husband threatened to kill wife and children (jealousy, alcohol problem);
4. Threatening wife and children (perpetrator's drug problem);
5. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
6. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
7. Husband threatened to kill his wife;
8. Threat/blackmail to a wife with killing the child;
9. Threat/blackmail to a wife with killing the child.

Annex C – SOS Line Nikšić – Data Analysis 2002 - 2006

2002 Data

Handgun threat:

- Husband harassed wife and threatened to shoot her with a pistol or cut her throat.

Knife threat:

- Husband threatened his wife with a knife and once put the pistol into her mouth, once to her stomach;
- Husband threatened with a knife to kill her. *Tried once to kill her: “slightly cutting her throat with a knife” (her statement), hit her head with a metal bar, she tried committing suicide twice;*
- Grandfather threatened to kill his granddaughter and the whole family. A butcher by profession and threatened to do that with butcher’s tools (after reporting to the police, the tools were taken away), *to his wife, tried once strangling her grandmother, and once tried to hurt her with a screwdriver, neighbours stopped.*

Armed, no data of the type of firearms and the use of arms:

- During divorce proceedings husband threatened to kill his wife. He holds no firearms in the house, but he said he could get hold of a gun, if need be. He also said he could kill her in various ways: with a knife, a bar or some other object.

Threat or attempted murder, no data on the use of arms:

- Husband threatened to kill wife and children. He broke everything around the house, threw pieces of furniture at them (chairs, parts of the table);
- Husband beats her “to death”. She thinks she cannot continue living like that for long and believes she will soon die of beatings. Tried committing suicide because of the violence she suffers;
- Wife left her husband and when he met her in the street he took her to a bridge some dozen kilometres away from the town, threatened to kill her and throw her into the river;
- Wife suffers physical violence. Last time her husband threw a chair at her. “Luckily, he missed me; otherwise, I would probably be disabled or dead by now”;
- Husband tried to *strangle her* while she was sleeping.

2003 Data

Bomb threat:

- Husband threatened to throw a bomb and kill her and the children.

Knife threat:

- Husband tried to *kill his wife. Attacked her with a knife* and she managed to escape and ask for help.

2004 Data

Knife threat:

- Wife left her husband. He threatens to kill her and her family (she is afraid he might hurt her with anything: a knife, a metal bar, or anything “that comes handy”).

Threat or attempted murder, no data on the use of firearms:

- Husband encountered his wife in the street. Threatened to kill her for having left him and hurt her in the chest;
- Husband beats her constantly, threatening to kill her;
- Threatened his daughter by putting a knife under her throat and forcing her to speak badly of her mother, his wife who left him. Woman, 38 years of age – four children, husband batters her. She left.

2005 Data

Threats with a metal bar:

- Husband beat her in the street with a metal bar. He threatened to kill other women who tried to help her.

Threat or attempted murder, no data on the use of firearms:

- Wife suffers physical violence from her husband and is afraid she would get killed from beatings.

2006 Data

Knife threats:

- For the past ten or so years husband keeps threatening to kill his wife (to cut her throat);
- A woman, 63, a widow, three children – her brother-in-law threatened to shoot her with a pistol because of unresolved property issues;
- Husband beats his wife and threatens to kill her/put a knife under her throat;
- Accusing her of witchcraft, a cousin and his wife came to the house of an old lady and threatened to “cut her throat if their son who fell sick does not get better”;
- A husband threatened his wife to kill her. Once, being drunk, took a butcher’s knife and waited for her to come back from the town to cut her throat. His mother waited for her in front of the house and warned her to go somewhere until he “sobers up”;
- Husband battered his wife. When she left him, he tried to kill her (several stabs with a knife) in front of the children.

Armed, no data on the type of firearms and the use of arms:

- A minor (female) gave birth to a child out of wedlock and ran away from home. Father who was abroad said she should not wait for his return because he would kill her (“shoot her”);
- “Husband beats her” and when she faints of beatings he pours water on her until she regains consciousness, then continues with beatings. Last time, among other things, he threw glasses, plates, jars at her, anything that is to hand;
- Husband *tried to strangle his wife*. He keeps threatening to kill her and her family (brothers, mother father) if she leaves him.



ISBN 86-7728-071-0



9 788677 280710